

Binding

The Department of State

bulletin

U.S. COMMANDS U.N. COMMANDS MARCHES IN KOREA & How of Security Council President	22
THE UNITED NATIONS AND KOREA & By Ambassador	22
U.S. MILITARY ACTIONS IN KOREA & Address by	22
U.S. & AN INVESTMENT IN PEACE & Address by	22

XXIII, No. 576
July 17, 1950





The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XXIII, No. 576 • PUBLICATION 3913

July 17, 1950

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$6, foreign \$8.50
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has
been approved by the Director of the
Bureau of the Budget (February 18, 1949).

Note: Contents of this publication are not
copyrighted and items contained herein may
be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT
OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be
appreciated.

U.N. Places Unified Command of Military Forces in Korea Under United States

TEXT OF SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION¹

"The Security Council,

"HAVING DETERMINED that the armed attack upon the Republic of Korea by forces from North Korea constitutes a breach of the peace.

"HAVING RECOMMENDED that the members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area,

"1. *Welcomes*, the prompt and vigorous support which Governments and peoples of the United Nations have given to its resolutions of 25 and 27 June 1950 to assist the Republic of Korea in defending itself against armed attack and thus to restore international peace and security in the area;

"2. *Notes* that members of the United Nations have transmitted to the United Nations offers of assistance for the Republic of Korea;

"3. *Recommends* that all members providing military forces and other assistance pursuant to the aforesaid Security Council resolutions make such forces and other assistance available to a unified command under the United States;

"4. *Requests* the United States to designate the commander of such forces;

"5. *Authorizes* the unified command at its discretion to use the United Nations flag in the course of operations against North Korean forces concurrently with the flags of the various nations participating;

"6. *Requests* the United States to provide the Security Council with reports as appropriate on the course of action taken under the unified command."

¹ Introduced by France and U.K. (S/1588) and adopted on July 7 by a vote of 7 to 0, with 3 abstentions (Egypt, India, and Yugoslavia); Soviet Union was absent.

GENERAL MacARTHUR DESIGNATED AS COMMANDING GENERAL

Statement by the President

[Released to the press by the White House July 8]

The Security Council of the United Nations, in its resolution of July 7, 1950, has recommended that all members providing military forces and other assistance pursuant to the Security Council resolutions of June 25 and 27, make such forces and other assistance available to a unified command under the United States.

The Security Council resolution also requests that the United States designate the commander of such forces, and authorizes the unified command at its discretion to use the United Nations flag in the course of operations against the North Korean forces concurrently with the flags of the various nations participating.

I am responding to the recommendation of the Security Council and have designated General Douglas MacArthur as the Commanding General of the military forces which the members of the United Nations place under the unified command of the United States pursuant to the United Nations' assistance to the Republic of Korea in repelling the unprovoked armed attack against it.

I am directing General MacArthur, pursuant to the Security Council resolution, to use the United Nations flag in the course of operations against the North Korean forces concurrently with the flags of the various nations participating.

Ambassador Austin Comments on Resolution

On July 7, Ambassador Austin told the Security Council that the United States accepts the responsibility and makes the sacrifice that is involved in carrying out these principles of the United Nations. In spirit, if not in word, this resolution has been in effect since the very first resolution was adopted in response to the call for help from Korea.

The United Nations and Korea

by Philip C. Jessup
*Ambassador at Large*¹

The Communist-inspired attack on the Republic of Korea is the most barefaced attack on the United Nations itself. An assault upon the United Nations headquarters at Lake Success could hardly have been more direct or more revealing. Of all the countries in the world, none is more closely identified with the United Nations than the Republic of Korea. Despite the actions of the Soviet Union, from March 20, 1946, to September 23, 1947, to prevent the establishment of Korea as a free and independent nation, the United Nations helped to set it up when the United States laid the case of Korea before the world organization.

As could be expected, the propaganda of worldwide Communist imperialism has tried to hide its aggression under a flood of lies. As Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record."

Record on Korea

Fortunately, the record is crystal clear. There have been times in history when serious and conscientious scholars have debated the question "Who started the war?" No serious or conscientious scholar can have any question here. The North Korean Communist forces attacked the Republic of Korea without warning, without provocation, without any justification whatsoever. It has never been more true than in this case that actions speak louder than words. Communist peace propaganda has sought to lull the peoples of the free world at the very moment when Communist imperialism was preparing and launching this war of aggression.

Knowledge of the facts of the situation does not depend upon statements by the Korean Government nor upon statements by the Americans

on the spot. The United Nations has a Commission in Korea. At the last meeting of the General Assembly, this Commission was specifically authorized to have teams of observers to watch the 38th parallel, north of which the Communist forces were entrenched. This United Nations Commission is composed of representatives of the following countries: Australia, China, India, El Salvador, Turkey, the Philippines, and France. The Commission's team of observers had concluded an on-the-spot survey, barely 24 hours before the Communist forces attacked. Here is what these impartial United Nations representatives reported.

U.N. COMMISSION REPORT

The principal impression left with observers after their field tour is that the South Korean Army is organized for defense and is in no condition to carry out an attack on a large scale against forces of the North . . .

This impression, they said, was based on eight observations including the facts that "there is no concentration of [South Korean] troops and no massing for attack visible at any point".

At several points, North Korean forces are in effective possession of salients on the south side of the parallel, occupation in at least one case being of fairly recent date. There is no evidence that South Korean forces have taken any steps for or making any preparation to eject North Korean forces from any of these salients . . .

So far as the equipment of South Korean forces is concerned, in absence of armour, air support, and heavy artillery, any action with object of invasion would, by any military standards, be impossible . . .

In general, they reported, the attitude of South Korean commanders is one of vigilant defense. Their instructions do not go beyond retirement in case of attack upon previous prepared positions . . .

Immediately after the Communist forces of the

¹ Highlights of an address made before the Institute of Public Affairs, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., on July 10 and released to the press on the same date.

North attacked and began their invasion of the Republic of Korea the United Nations Commission reported as follows to Secretary-General Lie:

Commission met this morning 1000 hours and considered latest reports on hostilities and results direct observation along parallel by UNCOK Military observers over period ending forty-eight hours before hostilities began. Commission's present view on basis this evidence is first that judging from actual progress of operations Northern Regime is carrying out well-planned concerted and full scale invasion of South Korea, second that South Korean forces were deployed on wholly defensive basis in all sectors of the parallel and third, that they were taken completely by surprise . . .

The Security Council had the evidence and passed judgment immediately. The judgment of the Security Council is the judgment of the world organization. The Communist invaders have been adjudged as having launched an armed attack and no amount of Communist propaganda will succeed in hiding the "mark of Cain" on their foreheads.

U.N. RESOLUTION

In view of the attempt of Communist propaganda to confuse the issue let us get one other point clear on the record. The Communist forces attacked on Sunday, June 25, at 4:00 a.m., Korean time. The United Nations Security Council met at 2:00 p.m. Washington time on Sunday, June 25th, and by 6:00 p.m. that afternoon adopted a resolution determining that the armed attack of the North Koreans constituted a breach of the peace. They called upon all members of the United Nations to assist.

What had the United States done before the Security Council issued this judgment and appeal? The only steps which the United States took prior to 6:00 p.m. on Sunday were:

U.S. ACTION

(1) It took the initiative in the early morning hours of Sunday to call the Security Council to consider this aggression immediately.

(2) It began the evacuation of American women and children from the danger area.

(3) In the immediate vicinity of Seoul, the capital of Korea, it provided the necessary military protection to keep these women and children from being killed during the course of the evacuation.

It was not until 10:30 p.m. on June 25, after the Security Council had passed its resolution, that the first orders were issued by the President of the United States directing that assistance should be given to the Republic of Korea in pursuance of the Security Council resolution.

During the next day, as the armed forces from North Korea advanced southward, the United States continued to carry out the resolution of June 25 by increasing its aid to the Korean Government.

When the Security Council met again two days later, on June 27th, and made more specific its appeal for help to the Republic of Korea, the President of the United States ordered an intensification of our help. The free world greeted these actions with enthusiastic approval and forty-six members of the United Nations have already signified to the headquarters of the United Nations their approval and support of the Security Council resolution. The armed forces of six members, in addition to those of the United States, are either already participating in giving help to the Republic of Korea or have announced that these forces are being made available. Other members have offered other types of material assistance. Here indeed is collective security in action.

Before going back to consider these matters in more detail let us summarize these essential points which the record proves.

(1) The Communist forces in North Korea attacked without warning and without provocation. They started it. That is what the Prime Minister of India, Pandit Nehru, calls the "Major fact of well-planned invasion and aggression of South Korea".

(2) The Security Council as the authorized representative of the world's organization responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security has found that these are the facts which were established by the report of its own United Nations Commission on the spot.

(3) The United States acted promptly as a loyal member of the United Nations and everything which it has done has been in support of the action of the United Nations in the effort to stop the Communist armed attack and to restore peace in the area.

Let us now go back to consider some of these items in more detail. Let us first look at the Communist propaganda line which says in effect that the United Nations has no right to keep the peace when it is Communist imperialists who have committed a breach of the peace.

Answer to Soviet Illegality Charge

The Soviet Union argues that the Security Council is without power to act if their representative violates his Charter obligation to participate in its meetings.

It is necessary first to recall that article 24 of the Charter says that the members of the United Nations confer on the Security Council "primary responsibility for the maintenance of interna-

tional peace and security". In the next place article 28 of the Charter says that—

The Security Council shall be so organized as to be able to function continuously. Each member of the Security Council shall for this purpose be represented at all times at the seat of the Organization.

This is the language of the Charter. It is perfectly clear that a state which is a member of the Security Council is obligated to be in a position at all times to take part in its work. This provision would have no meaning if in spite of having a representative at the seat of the organization the representative should have a right to refuse to attend the meetings. The Soviet Union has thus violated its obligations under the Charter by resorting to the tactics of "walking out."

Disregarding this question, the Soviet Union argues that it nevertheless has the power to cripple the functioning of the Security Council because article 27 of the Charter says that decisions of the Security Council on substantive matters—

... shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members including the concurring votes of the permanent members.

Since the Soviet Union is a permanent member, it is argued that the absence of their concurring vote invalidates the action of the Council.

The history of the drafting of this article and of its application in practice leads to quite a different conclusion. The provision which I have just cited from article 27 about the concurring votes of the permanent members is, of course, the legal language describing the decision at the San Francisco conference to give the permanent members a veto on substantive questions. The Charter is a constitutional document and like all constitutions, including that of the United States, the exact meaning of its words is developed by practice.

U.S.S.R. PAST ACTIONS CONTRADICT CHARGE

One of the practices in the Security Council which has developed over the years is the practice of abstaining from voting on questions which are put to the vote. The Soviet Union, beginning in April 1948, abstained in four instances on Security Council resolutions dealing with Palestine.² Beginning in January 1948, the Soviet Union abstained on four resolutions dealing with the Kashmir case. Beginning in December 1948, the Soviet Union abstained on two resolutions in the Indonesian case. In none of these ten cases has the Soviet Union challenged the legality of the action taken by the Security Council. Furthermore, the Soviet Union has never questioned the legality of action taken by the Security Council in which it voted with the majority but

on which other permanent members of the Council abstained. This has occurred in at least three instances. We thus already have over a dozen cases in which it has been established that the meaning of article 27 of the Charter is that, while the negative vote of a permanent member can defeat the substantive resolution, the failure of a permanent member to vote for a resolution does not defeat it.

Clearly it can make no difference in terms of the application of the Charter on this point whether the representative of a permanent member sits at the table and abstains or whether he fails to come at all. The essential difference relates to the question of a member's sense of responsibility and willingness to discharge its obligations under the Charter. The Soviet Union had the legal power to attend the meeting of the Security Council and, by taking the responsibility before the world, to cast a veto to block Security Council action. The U.S.S.R. did not have the power to block action by staying away from the meeting in violation of its obligations under article 28.

The consideration of this part of the Soviet Union's argument would not be complete without mention of the excuse which the Soviet Government has given for its recent refusal to cooperate with the United Nations. The excuse is that a majority of the members have not accepted the Soviet view that the representative of the Chinese Communists should be seated as the representative of China. The position of the United States on this point has been frequently stated. Our position is that we are always ready to abide by the decision which is made by any one of the organs of the United Nations in accordance with the established procedures of that organ. We have never taken the position that we will disregard decisions merely because we do not agree with them. We have made it very clear that we do not believe that this question of deciding what representative is entitled to sit for his government is subject to the veto. We believe that under established rules this is a procedural question to which the veto does not apply.

It is also necessary to recall that the Soviet tactics of resorting to a walk-out in the United Nations has not been confined to the pretext of the issue of Chinese Communist representation. Mr. Gromyko resorted to the same tactics in the case of Iran in 1946; the trick was unsuccessful then as now. If the question is asked whether China was represented at the meetings of the Security Council on June 25th and 27th, the answer is clearly yes. The Security Council had considered the claim of the Soviet Union that the Chinese Government was not entitled to represent China, and it rejected this claim. Until this decision is changed by a duly authorized organ of the United Nations, it obviously stands as the decision which the members are bound to follow.

² See BULLETIN of July 10, 1950, p. 48.

U.S. vs. U.S.S.R. Policy Toward Asia

It is a familiar pattern of international Communist propaganda that they loudly accuse others of the sins which they themselves have committed. It is therefore not surprising that they accuse the United States of imperialism in Asia, because the Russian imperialistic design is the same in Asia today as it was under the Czars. The Soviet encroachments upon Chinese sovereignty in Manchuria, Mongolia, Sinkiang, and elsewhere have frequently been pointed out. The Soviet Union and its satellites were the only members of the United Nations which refused during the last General Assembly to join in approving a resolution reasserting the historic American doctrine of respect for the integrity of China.

The experience of so-called Communist "liberation" of strongly nationalist states like Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia holds out the gloomiest prospects for the peoples of Asia. During the period of this type of Soviet "liberation," what has been the record of the Western world? The Philippines and Burma have become separate independent states. India, Pakistan and Ceylon have become independent states, members of the Commonwealth. Indonesia has also become independent and a member of the Netherlands-Indonesian Union. Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam have become independent members of the French Union. Once again, the record is the proof to which we turn. The Communist propaganda cannot wipe out the facts.

The United States has steadily supported the development of independent nationalism throughout Asia. We supported the cause of Indonesia in the United Nations Security Council when the Communist international movement was denouncing the Indonesian patriotic leaders, Sukarno and Hatta as "traitors." It was the United States which took the case of Korea to the United Nations and sought United Nations guarantees for Korean independence. It was the Soviet Union which by walkout and noncooperation blocked the union of the country which all real Korean patriots desire.

The objective and purpose of the United States in Korea today is to support the United Nations effort to restore and maintain peace. We are helping to carry out Security Council resolutions which call for a cease-fire, the withdrawal of the North Koreans to the 38th parallel, and for the restoration of international peace and security in the area. Thereafter, we shall continue our policy of supporting the United Nations in its efforts to secure a permanent adjustment of the situation in Korea in the interest of the Korean people. We have no other or separate interest of our own.

Other Attacks To Be Defeated

It is always true that at times when thought and action are concentrated upon meeting an emer-

gency a conscious effort is required to keep in mind the importance of moving forward with long-range plans. The present situation in Korea requires and is receiving the concentrated attention of the Government of the United States. But, at the same time, we must go forward with many other plans and policies. It should be particularly emphasized that this great demonstration of combined action under the United Nations cannot be allowed to slacken the efforts of this world organization to grapple with the fundamental problems affecting the peace and welfare of mankind. One of the most important of the long-range efforts of the United Nations is the program of technical assistance which is allied to our own Point 4 Program. Sudden aggressive armed attacks on peaceful, independent states must be met and rolled back, but the peace and welfare of mankind are always under attack by poverty and disease. Our resources are adequate to cooperate in this perennial struggle at the same time that we are meeting the emergency of the moment. We have demonstrated to the world our will and our ability to meet the emergency; surely we will not fail through support of the Point 4 Program to do our full part in the longer campaign.

Charging South Korea as Aggressor Reminiscent of Nazi Tactics

Statement by Secretary Acheson

[Released to the press July 5]

In regard to the Korean hostilities, four simple points must be recognized and long-remembered by all the world. The people of this free nation have clearly shown that they know the truth and are not going to be misled by false versions of it. These are the facts:

1. The present troubles in Korea started not when the United Nations Security Council acted or when the United States and others acted in support of the Security Council. It all started at dawn on Sunday, June 25, Korean time.

2. At that time, troops from North Korea, without any provocation whatever, crossed the 38th parallel and launched an aggressive attack against the Republic of Korea. All the reliable witnesses, on the scene, at the time, including the United Nations Commission, have established that the North Korean forces were the aggressors.

3. The Security Council of the United Nations acted in support of the Republic of Korea only after it was satisfied that this was a case of utterly unprovoked aggression.

4. Any contention that hostilities were started by the Republic of Korea is clearly in the category of the Nazi claims of 1939 that Poland started hostilities by attacking Nazi Germany.

U.S. Military Actions in Korea

*Addresses by John Foster Dulles
Consultant to the Secretary*

NEW PHASE OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY¹

The Korean affair obviously brings us nearer to the day of fateful decision. Also, it makes it more probable that we will make the kind of effort needed to fend off the utter disaster of war.

The danger of war has lain largely in our past failure to see clearly and respond adequately to the peril that stems from Soviet communism. That slowness is probably inevitable in a democracy when national policy depends on public opinion. However, even now it is not too late to put peace onto a more stable basis than ever before.

The nature of the Soviet Communist threat has been fully set out by Stalin himself in his *Problems of Leninism*. The latest English edition, printed in Moscow, is dated 1940. Stalin there outlines the program, whereby, Soviet communism expects to extend its system throughout the world and establish its "one world" of state socialism. The plan is to conquer the weaker countries, one by one, by methods of propaganda, penetration, subversive warfare, and, as a last resort, open war. The strongest non-Communist countries, notably the United States, will be left to the last and, gradually, encircled and their economies weakened until, finally, they are supposed either to capitulate voluntarily or be overthrown by open assault which the Communist countries will presumably then have the power to launch successfully. Stalin points out, and this dates back to 1925, that the "road to victory" over the West lies through "revolutionary alliance with the liberation movement" in the colonies and countries of the East. The hostile tide of communism in Asia, which looms so danger-

ously today, has been announced and actively nurtured for 25 years.

Stalin's Strategy

Stalin's book, which is the present-day Communist bible, except in Yugoslavia, gives us the same preview that Hitler gave in *Mein Kampf*. There is, however, an important distinction between the Hitler program and the Stalin program. Hitler felt that his whole program had to be achieved in short order, during his own lifetime. That required intensive and sustained offensive action. In the case of the Communist program, there is no such time urgency. It is anticipated that full realization of the Communist conquest may take what Stalin refers to as "an entire historical era." And, he teaches, that "tactics of retreat" are as important as tactics of attack. Also, he teaches, the necessity of compromise when, as he puts it, this is necessary "to buy off a powerful enemy and gain a respite."

Therefore, under the Communist program, war by Russia is not necessarily inevitable or imminent if we are powerful enough to make it seem expedient to the Soviet Communist leaders to use tactics of delay or compromise.

U.S. Awakens to Reality

We have only recently begun to take seriously Stalin's world program for communism, long announced, superbly implemented, and already one-third consummated. Our national attitude has only gradually moved toward realism. There has been an evolution through four phases:

1. *Cooperation*.—That was the war phase. When Hitler made the Soviet Union and the United States war allies, there was a military necessity of cooperation that made it expedient to draw a veil over the basically hostile attitude of Soviet communism toward the United States. We

¹ An address made at Colgate University Conference on American Foreign Policy, Hamilton, N. Y., in July 7 and released to the press on the same date.

emphasized the courageous fighting qualities of the Russian people, and we ignored the basic antipathy toward us of the Communist leaders. On the theory that the Soviet Union had to be given inducements to prevent her making a separate peace with Germany and to get her to enter into the war against Japan, we agreed to go along with large Soviet postwar expansion in both central Europe and in Asia.

2. *Noncooperation.*—The second phase of our policy came immediately after the close of the fighting. The Soviet Union then sought to secure continuing support from the United States for her expansionist policy. Her leaders argued that postwar cooperation of the Soviet Union and the United States was necessary in order to assure world peace and that that cooperation necessitated the United States acquiescing in the expansionist ambitions of the Soviet Union. That was in essence the Molotov thesis which was presented at the first Council of Foreign Ministers meeting at London, in September 1945, which I attended with Secretary Byrnes. We then made the momentous decision that we would not continue in time of peace the Yalta type of appeasement which had seemed necessary in time of war.

That decision taken at London, in the fall of 1945, did not, however, immediately make itself felt throughout all aspects of the United States foreign policy. Notably, there was a lag in bringing our Eastern policy into line with our Western policy. Many Eastern students were impressed by the abuses and deficiencies of existing Eastern governments and felt that a good dose of Communist reform might be healthy.

3. *Prevention.*—The third phase of American policy was marked by realization that there was in fact an irreconcilable conflict between the ambitions of Soviet communism and the interests and welfare of the United States and that we needed to assert ourselves positively to prevent the extension of Soviet communism. This new approach came out of the 1947 Moscow and London Conferences of the Council of Foreign Ministers which I attended with Secretary Marshall. Between these two Council meetings came the Marshall Plan proposal (June 1947). We then clearly saw that we were threatened by a so-called "cold war," and we made up our minds to make positive efforts to strengthen the free world and to fill up military, economic, and moral vacuums into which Soviet communism was moving.

Our maximum efforts were directed to Europe. But there was also a change of policy in the Far East, as indicated by the fact that in August 1948 Secretary Marshall advised our Embassy in China that "the United States Government must not directly or indirectly give any implication of support, encouragement, or acceptability of coalition government in China with Communist participation."

We have, however, up to now, assumed, and

that was a fair working hypothesis, that communism would probably limit itself to "cold war" tactics and that there would not be open military attack. However, some preparations were made as against the possibility of armed attack, notably in Western Europe. We made the North Atlantic Treaty and adopted the Military Assistance Program.

4. *Opposition.*—The fourth phase of policy is marked by the North Korean attack upon South Korea and our active fighting opposition under the direction of the United Nations. The Korean affair shows that communism cannot be checked merely by building up sound domestic economies. The South Korean experiment in democracy was as hopeful as could be expected. There was political, intellectual, and economic freedom. The second national election had just been held, and the majority elected were independent of the party in power which controlled the police force and the election machinery. The fact that that could happen is good evidence of political freedom. As recently as 2 weeks ago, I met with the Korean National Assembly, with leading educators, with religious groups, businessmen, and representatives of labor. I conferred with our mission, and economic advisers, and with the Korean Commission of the United Nations. All the evidence was that the Republic of Korea provided a wholesome, free society and one which could not be overthrown by subversive efforts. Such efforts had, indeed, been repeatedly tried and had failed. The military blow from the north dissipates the thesis that internal reform and well-being is itself a sufficient defense against Communist aggression.

Korea Attack Part of Communist Plan

The armed attack that occurred shows that, while the Soviet Union seems not at the moment prepared to engage its own army, nevertheless, international communism is prepared to use, in open warfare, the armed forces of puppet and satellite Communist states which are equipped with armament of Russian manufacture.

It was realized for some time that the Republic of Korea was in danger of attack from the north. Proof of that is found in the fact that the United Nations continued its Korean Commission after the government of the Republic had been set up under United Nations supervision, and in the fall of 1949, the General Assembly added to the functions of the Commission the task of maintaining military observation along the northern frontier.

When, I, myself, went to the Far East, on June 14th, it was primarily to look into the possibilities of the Japanese peace treaty. But I went first to Korea to acquaint myself personally with a situation which, for several years, I had dealt with as a United States delegate to the United Nations. I was concerned about the increasing insistence by the North Korean Communist regime that it must rule all of Korea and the intensive Com-

munist propaganda in South Korea that it had better succumb to communism without resistance, because neither the United Nations nor the United States would give protection if the Republic should be attacked.

Before leaving Washington, I drafted a speech to be made in Korea. In it I said that if the Republic of Korea were attacked, it could expect support from the United Nations. I pointed out that the United Nations Charter required all nations "to refrain from any threat or use of force against your territorial integrity or political independence" and, I added, that the United States stood behind the United Nations. I concluded with these words:

You are not alone. You will never be alone so long as you continue to play worthily your part in the great design of human freedom.

That address was made on June 19th at the opening of the Second National Assembly. It was broadcast in the Korean language, throughout Korea, and Korean language leaflet copies were widely distributed. Nevertheless, 6 days later the North Korean army struck, in a long-prepared and fully implemented effort. There were ample supplies of Russian-made planes, tanks, and heavy artillery. The Republic's army fought bravely but hopelessly. It had no combat planes, no tanks, and no artillery heavy enough to stop the invading tanks. Unopposed enemy planes flew low, strafing the civilian population, setting fire to gasoline supplies, and spreading terror throughout the capital area. In 3 days, Seoul, 30 miles south of the northern border, was captured, and the tank formations moved on to the south.

New Phase in American Foreign Policy

This open military attack and United Nations resistance to it opens a new phase in American foreign policy. It will, I hope and believe, arouse us to a greater effort than any we have yet made to fend off the danger of war. It may require us to devote a greater percentage of our vast economic productivity to military production so that other free nations will not be exposed to being overrun by Communist satellite forces equipped with armament furnished by Russia.

What has happened to the Republic of Korea shows, I fear, that the communistic assaults cannot be prevented merely by economic aid or merely by developing good societies. The open military assault on the Republic of Korea occurred because the Republic of Korea was too good a society to be tolerated on the otherwise Communist-dominated mainland of north Asia, and because it was so good that it could not be overthrown from within by indirect aggression. Direct aggression was the only way to blot out this moral salient on the Communist mainland.

There are probably two further reasons for the attack. One was that if it succeeded it would

envelop Japan both from the north, where the Russians now have already gained hold of all of Sakhalin Island and the Kurile Islands, and from the south, where Korea is only separated by a narrow strait from the south of Japan. There was doubtless a desire to throw a roadblock in the way of the positive program of the United States for putting Japan onto a peaceful and self-governing basis, as part of the free world.

Furthermore, the Communists doubtless calculated that if the attack failed through the use of United States force to repel the attack, the process would bog down the West in the mire of anti-colonialism in Asia.

As we have seen, Stalin long ago calculated that the best way to conquer the West was to involve it in fighting the anticolonial aspirations of Asia and the Pacific. The colonial powers, including the United States in the Philippines, Britain in India, Burma, and Ceylon, and the Dutch in Indonesia, by wise statesmanship, extricated themselves largely from this trap. No doubt the Korean venture is designed in part to draw the Western world back into that trap. That is a danger that has to be carefully avoided by relating our conduct to the policies of the United Nations which, as an organization, is strongly dedicated to self-government and independence for the non-self-governing peoples of the world.

Prospects for Peace

The situation is certainly fraught with danger.

However, if the members of the United Nations support and make good the Security Council decision to repel and throw back the unprovoked military aggression in Korea; if the defensive military position around the periphery of Soviet control is strengthened, so that satellite forces cannot easily break through with violence; if the colonial powers support the newly born nations and avoid general entanglement with the legitimate independence aspirations of the Asiatic peoples; then there will be a condition where peace is likely, unless the Soviet Union itself commits its total might to total war. It may not be prepared to do this because of its relative economic weakness.

Speaking in Tokyo on June 22, 1950, I pointed out that, in terms of key commodities such as steel, aluminum, electric power, and crude oil, the United States had an advantage over the Soviet Union of anywhere from five or ten to one. I concluded "Any struggle that openly pitted the full might of the free world against that of the captive world could have but one outcome. That would be the total demolition of the artificial, rigid, and relatively weak structure that Soviet communism has built." I believe that that is a correct analysis of the present situation. I do believe, however, that it will be necessary for us to convert more of our economic potential into present strength in order that the free nations who

are menaced by Communist military attack can be better protected.

In the case of Korea, it was felt necessary to give a very low priority to the military position of the Republic of Korea because of the great shortage of available military equipment. Congress had appropriated funds to extend the Military Assistance Program to Korea. However, it had not yet been found possible to convert that appropriation into a reality. When I was there, the Korean defense establishment pointed out that while the morale and discipline of the Republic's army was first class, they could not be expected to hold for long without a single combat plane, without any tanks, without antiaircraft guns, and without artillery sufficient to stop the known concentrations of enemy tanks on the border.

We are now having to make good that deficiency in a costly way.

What has happened in Korea will, I think, bring home to the American people the need of adequate measures to strengthen the free world as against the possibility of sudden, armed attack. If we do that, we can close the most dangerous remaining loophole for war.

If we have strength; if we and the other members of the free world put that strength at the disposition of the United Nations; if the United Nations continues to show a capacity for decisive action, that will check the likelihood of a series of little wars which could develop into a big war.

Relations between the free world and the Communist world are no doubt in a dangerous phase. It is a period of testing. Out of it could come great disaster. Equally, the test could supply proof that peace has been established on a basis sounder than ever before in history.

THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF INDEPENDENCE²

The Declaration of Independence is expressed not in terms of American rights but in terms of the natural moral rights of all men. It proceeds from the promise that all men "are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights," and the Founding Fathers made it clear that they were setting a pattern of freedom for men everywhere.

Largely under the inspiration of that example, the nineteenth century became a great period of liberalism, when human beings freed themselves from the yoke of despotism. Wherever they sought to do so, they had the support of the United States.

We early established the Monroe Doctrine, to warn Czarist Russia and its allies to keep their hands off the republics of this hemisphere whose

continuing independence, we said, was vital to our own peace and happiness. Toward the end of the nineteenth century, we enunciated the "Open Door" policy for China, to help the Chinese people develop in their own way, free of alien domination. In this twentieth century, we have joined in two world wars when the freedom of the West was imperiled by military despotism. Five years ago, we signed the United Nations Charter and, thereby, pledged ourselves to seek universal respect for human rights, and fundamental freedoms, and the preservation of political independence as against violent attack.

U.S. Tradition—Support of Human Freedom

The history of our Nation makes a consistent, unfolding pattern. We have supported human freedom and political independence throughout the world, both as a matter of good morals and because we saw that our own freedom was an integral part of total human freedom.

The United States can never be isolationist, and it never will be so long as we are true to our heritage. An isolationist America would be a contradiction in terms, for America has from the beginning been a symbol of the universal cause of human liberty. What we are doing today is in keeping with the tradition of our past.

I was in Korea only 2 weeks ago and saw with my own eyes that that Republic was a land of freedom. The people had just had their second general election. Eighty percent of the eligible voters had gone to the polls. A majority of the representatives elected were independent of the party which controlled the election machinery and the police force. That is proof of real political liberty.

I talked with leading educators and attended a gathering of professors and students at one of their leading universities. I spent an evening of religious worship with 3,000 Christian refugees who had fled from the northern dictatorship of atheistic communism so as to enjoy the religious and intellectual liberty of the Republic of Korea. There was no doubt as to the reality of that liberty. The people were happy and industrious and using energetically and cooperatively their new-found freedom.

The society was so wholesome that it could not be overthrown from within. That had been tried and failed. So early Sunday morning, 9 days ago, open aggression was brought into play. Without warning, heavy tank formations drove down from the north, moving through the valleys to converge first upon the capital of Seoul, then to fan out to the south. They were preceded and covered by combat planes which, swooping low, machine-gunned and terrorized the civilian population. The forces of the Republic had no combat planes, tanks, or heavy artillery with which to oppose them.

² In an address made at the Sesquicentennial Fourth of July Celebration, at Washington, D.C., and released to the press on the same date.

Korean Attack—Military Despotism

The long-prepared, suddenly exploded, ruthless attack was characteristic of military despotism. It was, in miniature, the kind of attack that could hit us if we are content to live in a world where such methods are tolerated. The struggle in Korea represents the timeless issue of whether lovers of liberty will be vigilant enough, brave enough, and united enough to survive despotism.

The United States, as a member of the United Nations, had helped to create the Korean Republic. We had given it economic aid. We alone of the free world had military strength in the immediate area. We were the logical first defenders of the liberty that had been assaulted.

It was, however, important that we should not act alone or without international sanction. The United Nations had been established for the very purpose of dealing with such situations. Its Security Council met within a few hours of the opening of the assault. All of the members were present, except the Soviet Union, which sought by absence to veto restraint on the aggressive action of its satellite in North Korea. The Council, nevertheless, acted. It had a direct report from its own Commission in Korea and, in the light of that report, unhesitatingly, branded the attack as a breach of the peace. It called upon the member states to assist in repelling it.

President Truman, with bipartisan support, acted promptly and vigorously to bring the United States to respond to that appeal. The Governments of many other members of the United Nations did likewise.

Thus, we see international authority at work to prevent the committing, against the Republic of Korea, of what I call "international murder."

The task undertaken is not a light one and before it is finished we shall all of us have to pay a price. Already, today, in Korea, our youth are beginning to pay the final price of life itself. The rest of us may have to cut down on our economic indulgence so that, out of our great productive capacity, we can help our friends to match the offensive power which the Soviet Union, out of its economic poverty, supplies to its friends.

Threat to Liberty

I am confident that what has happened in Korea will arouse the American people. We have never flinched when a great principle was involved. We are engaged, today, in the same battle which was begun in 1776. Our own liberty cannot long be safe in a world where despots can strike down liberty, piecemeal, with fire and sword.

We have, today, the great opportunity to join with the other free societies to prove that unprovoked aggression does not pay. If we sternly teach that lesson in terms of the North Korean adventure, then our own peace will be more secure than ever before. But if the free world fails to

rally to the support of one of its stricken members, then one by one others would be struck down and military despotism, intoxicated by repeated victories, would lose all sense of restraint.

The United States has been ever bound, by faith and by sacrifice, to the cause of righteousness. Washington, under the shadow of whose monument we stand, committed our Nation in its youthful dedication. Lincoln, whose shrine adjoins, said that our Declaration of Independence envisioned liberty "not alone to the people of this country but hope for the world for all future time." We have never sat idly by when despots attempted by violence to snuff out that hope. Today, we face a new test. I am confident that our response will be worthy of our great heritage and that we shall not be afraid to live sacrificially and even dangerously in a righteous cause.

U.N. Commission Reestablishes Headquarters in Korea

*[Released to the press by the
U. N. Department of Public Information July 1]*

The United Nations Commission in Korea on July 1 adopted, in Tokyo, the following resolution:

WHEREAS information has been received from the Commission's advance party, including the Chairman and the Rapporteur, at present in Pusan (Fusan), Southern Korea, that satisfactory arrangements have now been made for the return of the Commission to the Republic of Korea.

RECALLING the Commission's decision of 27 June 1950 to transfer its headquarters temporarily from Seoul and to hold itself ready to return to Korea immediately subject to developments,

Decides to reestablish its seat forthwith in the Republic of Korea, and

WHEREAS facilities at present available in the Republic of Korea are limited, the Commission further decides to constitute the members of the Commission at present in Tokyo as an *Ad Hoc* Committee for the purpose of enabling the Commission in the Republic of Korea to keep in close touch with international developments and in particular with the Security Council.

The Commission members, at present in Pusan, Southern Korea, who, in accordance with this resolution now constitute the United Nations Commission on Korea, are: the Commission Chairman Dr. Yu-wan Liu (China), Henri Brionval (France), A. B. Jameison (Australia), who is the rapporteur of the Commission and C. Kondapi, deputy representative of India. The representatives of the remaining three member states of the Commission—El Salvador, Philippines and Turkey—will remain in Tokyo to constitute the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

Col. Alfred G. Katzin, personal representative of Secretary-General Lie in Korea, arrived in that country on July 7; and, on July 8, he presented his credentials from the Secretary-General to the Korean Government.

Point Four: An Investment in Peace

*Address by the President*¹

It is hard for us to realize just how bad economic conditions are for many peoples of the world. Famine, disease, and poverty are the scourge of vast areas of the globe. Hundreds of millions of people in Asia, for example, have a life expectancy of 30 years or less. Many of these people live on inadequate diets, unable to perform the tasks necessary to earn their daily bread. Animal plagues and plant pests carry away their crops and their livestock. Misuse of natural resources exposes their land to flood or drought.

Conditions such as these are the seedbed of political unrest and instability. They are a threat to the security and growth of free institutions everywhere. It is in areas where these conditions exist that communism makes its greatest inroads. The people of these areas are eagerly seeking better living conditions. The Communists are attempting to turn the honest dissatisfaction of these people with their present conditions into support for Communist efforts to dominate their nations.

In addition to these attempts at persuasion, the Communists in these countries use the weapon of fear. They constantly threaten internal violence and armed aggression.

The recent unprovoked invasion of the Republic of Korea by Communist armies is an example of the danger to which the underdeveloped areas particularly are exposed.

It is essential that we do everything we can to prevent such aggression and to enforce the principles of the United Nations Charter. We must and we shall give every possible assistance to people who are determined to maintain their independence. We must counteract the Communist weapon of fear.

But we must not be misled into thinking that our only task is to create defenses against aggression. Our whole purpose in creating a strong

defense is to permit us to carry on the great constructive tasks of peace. Behind the shield of a strong defense, we must continue to work to bring about better living conditions in the free nations.

Strengthening Underdeveloped Nations

Particularly in the underdeveloped areas of the world, we must work cooperatively with local governments which are seeking to improve the welfare of their people. We must help them to help themselves. We must aid them to make progress in agriculture, in industry, in health, and in the education of their children. Such progress will increase their strength and their independence.

The growing strength of these countries is important to the defense of all free nations against Communist aggression. It is important to the economic progress of the free world. And these things are good for us as well as good for them.

For these reasons, I recommended in my inaugural address the program that has become known as "Point 4." The Congress has recently authorized technical assistance to underdeveloped areas under this program. This new law marks Congressional indorsement of a practical and sensible course of action that can have tremendous benefits for the future of the world.

It is possible to make tremendous improvements in underdeveloped areas by very simple and inexpensive means. Simple measures, such as the improvement of seed and animal stocks, the control of insects, the dissemination of health information, can make great changes almost overnight. This does not require vast expenditures. It requires only expert assistance offered to the people on a genuinely cooperative basis. We have already seen, on a relatively small scale, what can be accomplished.

I am going to give you a factual—a reporter's—account of a few technical assistance projects which have raised living standards in the countries where they were carried out. These are a preview of

¹ Made at the annual convention of the American Newspaper Guild, at Washington, D.C., on June 28 and released to the press by the White House on the same date.

what a full-scale Point 4 Program can mean in the future.

Successful Assistance Projects

In northern India, there is a very rich farming area known as the Terai district. In recent years, the malaria mosquito forced people to leave this land. One hundred and four villages were abandoned. Even in the face of India's tragic food shortage, no crops were planted in this rich soil.

India called on the World Health Organization for help, and that organization sent a malaria control team which arrived in northern India in April 1949. In the face of great difficulties, this international group sprayed the area with DDT.

Today, a year later, no infected mosquito is to be found in any village in the Terai district. Local workers have been trained to continue the spraying. Families who were refugees from malaria, only 1 year ago, are back in their homes, and their fields are green again.

This demonstrates how a simple program can make tremendous improvements in a short time.

Let me give you another example of what Point 4 can mean; this one in Iran. This story concerns not an international organization but one of our American voluntary groups, the Near East Foundation.

Four years ago, the Government of Iran asked the Foundation to set up a demonstration project in a group of 35 villages not far from the capital at Tehran. The Foundation brought village leaders to a series of training courses. It won their confidence, and through these leaders, it began to carry out agricultural and health improvements. The Foundation met a water shortage by drilling deep wells. It overcame water-borne diseases with an inexpensive water filter. It sprayed homes with DDT. It sprayed crops with insecticides. It helped to organize schools in each of the 35 villages.

Today, only 4 years later, the village people are at work in new carpentry shops, vegetable gardens, and orchards. And, most startling of all, the yield of grain in this area has tripled.

The effects of the Near East Foundation's work are spreading throughout Iran. This story will be matched many times over, under the Point 4 Program.

My next illustration is in the Republic of Liberia on the west coast of Africa. Here a United States Government economic mission has been working since 1944—headed, incidentally, by a former agricultural extension agent from Missouri. This mission in Liberia has laid out roads, and mapped the timber supply, and helped to open up an iron deposit. Agricultural technicians have helped to expand rice production for the local market and the production of palm oil and cocoa for export.

The effect of these steps has been remarkable. In one village near Monrovia, the cash income of

the people, derived from selling rice, cocoa, and palm oil, has increased from 5 dollars per person a year to 35 dollars, since the arrival of our economic mission.

Our mission—which has only five Americans in it—has worked in close cooperation with the Liberian Government. That Government already has built three new agricultural experiment stations. This is remarkable progress, but it is only the beginning of the economic development which Liberia needs to become a prosperous member of the family of nations.

Point 4: Equipment for Independence

These achievements I have cited are samples of the kind of work that needs so badly to be done in underdeveloped areas all over the world.

Under the expanded Point 4 Program, we can greatly enlarge the scope of these activities. There are tremendous opportunities to improve living standards for wide areas of the globe. It may prove altogether possible, for example, through the activities of the Food and Agriculture Organization, to wipe out the scourge of rinderpest, the fatal animal disease that is responsible for much of the rural poverty of the Far East. The development of hybrid rice seed, which the Food and Agriculture Organization is now working on, could conceivably increase rice production by 10 percent and improve the health and living conditions in the Orient immeasurably. As an example of what hybrid seed can do, our corn hybrids, where they have been used in Italy, have increased corn production by over 25 percent.

Aside from these basic improvements in agriculture and health, it is equally important, in many areas, to build modern communication and transportation systems and to establish local industries. Without these, the underdeveloped areas cannot put their natural resources to use for their own benefit and in profitable trade with the rest of the world. Building roads, and railroads, and factories will require considerable amounts of public and private capital. To aid the flow of American capital abroad, I have recommended that the Congress provide for limited guaranties to encourage greater investments overseas. I am hopeful that this legislation will be enacted soon.

Point 4 is not now—and should not become—a matter for partisan differences of opinion. However, some critics have attempted to ridicule Point 4 as a "do-good" measure; others have said it is a waste of money. This is the most foolish kind of shortsightedness. If we fail to carry out a vigorous Point 4 Program we run the risk of losing to communism, by default, hundreds of millions of people who now look to us for help in their struggle against hunger and despair.

Point 4 is an investment in a peaceful and prosperous world. It is a program which will bring increasing results over the years. It will bring about a chain reaction in economic development.

It will serve to create economic health where poverty existed, and to equip the people of underdeveloped areas to carry forward their economic gains and preserve their independence.

A major share of this world campaign to improve the livelihood of peoples will be carried out under the United Nations.

U.N. Technical Assistance Program

In the United Nations Charter, each member government pledged that it would promote solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems.

At its last session, the General Assembly voted unanimously to support a technical assistance program for raising the standard of living in underdeveloped areas.

Two weeks ago, the United Nations conducted a Technical Assistance Conference to make plans and to raise funds for this new program. Fifty-four nations attended and 50 of them offered contributions.

By the end of the Conference, more than 20 million dollars had been pledged. The United States pledged 12 million dollars, subject, of course, to the appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress. This was the largest single contribution, but, in relation to their resources,

a number of other nations contributed more.

The outstanding characteristic of this Technical Assistance Conference is the fact that it demonstrated clearly the common desire of the peoples of the world to work together for human advancement. In a world dark with apprehension, the Point 4 idea offers new hope.

All our citizens must play a part in making the Point 4 Program a success. Our missionary groups, our philanthropic and charitable agencies, must continue the efforts they have been making over the years for the improvement of conditions in foreign lands. Our young people can find careers in the pioneering work of bringing technical assistance to these countries. Our unions and our business organizations should enlarge their foreign contacts and bring the benefits of their experience to less developed countries. You newspaper men and women can help Point 4 to achieve its aims by telling its story to the American people and to the people of the world.

Our Point 4 Program and the work of the United Nations are constructive ways to build the kind of world where all nations can live in peaceful prosperity, dedicated to the purpose of creating better lives for their people. We support this program because we seek a peaceful world, and a free world, where all men can live as good neighbors.

Foreign Relations Volumes Released

American Republics

The Department of State announced on June 17 that it released on that date *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1933, Volume IV, The American Republics*. This volume contains the general section on problems of a multilateral nature and on relations with Argentina. Volume V, containing papers on bilateral relations with the other republics of the Western Hemisphere for 1933, will be published later. Volume II, dealing with the British Commonwealth, Europe, the Near East, and Africa, and Volume III, on the Far East, have previously been published.

Efforts to restore peace and to maintain good relations between the states of the Western Hemisphere are the chief subjects of this volume. Leading place is given to the Seventh International Conference of American States held at Montevideo in December 1933. Other major chapters of this volume record the combined efforts of the League of Nations and of the United States and other American governments to settle the Chaco dispute between Bolivia and Paraguay and the Leticia dispute between Colombia and Peru.

Copies of this volume (lxxxiv, 812 pp.) may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., for \$3.00 each.

Political and Economic Problems

The Department of State released on June 27 *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1933, Volume I, General*. This volume contains more than 800 documents on international political and economic problems, the multilateral aspects of which cannot be listed under separate country headings. Volumes II (British Commonwealth, Europe, Near East, and Africa), III (Far East), and IV, dealing with diplomatic negotiations among the American Republics and on relations with Argentina, have previously been published. Volume V, covering bilateral relations with the other American Republics, will be issued later.

Documents in volume I relate to the Conference for Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, the major political problem.

Other documents in this volume are devoted to the London Economic Conference.

Negotiations ancillary to the London Economic Conference, such as those relating to silver, copper, and wheat, are separately treated; similarly are those concerned with intergovernmental debts, initiation of the reciprocal trade agreements program, and the Foreign Bondholders Protective Council.

Copies of this volume (xciii, 991 pp.) may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, for \$3.75 each.

New Challenges to American Diplomacy

*by George C. McGhee, Assistant Secretary
for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs*¹

American policies grow out of the attitudes and vital interests of the American people. The purpose of our policies is, of course, to preserve and advance those interests. Now, what are the most important, the most vital of our American interests in the year 1950?

First, you will agree that our fundamental national interest is in peace and security. Therefore, it is our policy to create and maintain a world climate of peace; to eliminate the recurrent threat of war.

Second, we have a vital interest in being able to continue to enjoy, here in this country, our own democratic way of life. Our policies are, therefore, designed to strengthen, both here and abroad, the rights and freedoms of the individual which are basic to our system.

Third, we have an interest in economic progress, both as an end in itself and as a means of achieving our other objectives. Our policies must aim at improving our own standard of living. They must help to promote healthy economic conditions generally throughout the world.

A New American Interest

Now if we look back over the past half century, we see that these vital interests in peace, freedom, and economic progress have been continuously threatened and periodically attacked. The experience of two world wars and a major depression has taught us that we have a fourth vital interest. It has become clear that the peace, the freedom, the economic progress—more than these—the very survival of our country—depend on a clear recognition and a vigorous pursuit of that fourth national interest.

We have learned, in short, that we have a vital

interest in building an international community based on principles which have become universally accepted among civilized men but which have not been universally practiced among nations. Such an international community would permit the application, between nations, of the same basic principles that apply between individuals within a democracy. Each country would be able to make its own unique contribution to the world community in the light of its own particular history, interests, and capabilities.

Such a community, we have come to believe, offers the best and perhaps the only chance of preserving and promoting our national interests. I think it is accurate to say that the building of this community constitutes the boldest challenge to American leadership in the world today. To the present generation of Americans, it offers a tangible hope for a better world.

We have, moreover, already taken the lead in creating such a community, and much progress has been made. The Charter of the United Nations embodies the principles, and the organization of the United Nations provides a foundation, on which an international community can be built. We have taken further action to strengthen the foundation by means consistent with the Charter, such as the Rio pact and the North Atlantic Treaty.

I need not recount to you all that the free nations of the world have done to organize and strengthen themselves in the 5 short years since the end of hostilities. I predict that men will look back on this period as one of remarkable progress toward this end. Indeed, I think we tend to underestimate our achievements, to play down what we have succeeded in doing, and to highlight what we have not done.

Perhaps, on the other hand, we have not always correctly estimated the difficulties that were inherent in what we were trying to do. Perhaps, we did not foresee, and could not have foreseen,

¹ An address made before the Northwest Institute of International Relations at Portland, Oreg., on June 22 and released to the press on the same date.

that some of these difficulties would become serious obstacles to the building of an international community.

Obstacles To Building a World Community

One of those obstacles was a direct consequence of the war. It was nothing less than the temporary eclipse of Western Europe as a productive and progressive force in the world. What had been a great workshop, the largest single aggregation of skilled people in the world, an essential link in world trade, and the center of far-flung empires, was a continent in chaos and despair. Millions of its people were homeless, jobless, hungry, and without hope at the war's end.

With our help, these people are rebuilding their lives, reorganizing their societies in a new and more cooperative spirit. Today, Western Europe is still a stronghold of freedom. The gratifying response to the bold proposal of French Foreign Minister Schuman for the integration of the basic European industries, and to the proposed formation of the European Payments Union, shows that its members are playing an active and creative part in the building of our international community.

The postwar collapse of Western Europe might have delayed indefinitely and even prevented the building of a strong community of free nations. The fact that the trend has been reversed by a combination of creative imagination, planning, and sheer hard work, is, as General Marshall put it, a "near miracle." The fact that the Western European countries have not all rebuilt their economies on strictly American lines seems to trouble some people. To me, it demonstrates that there is room for wide diversity of approach to the problems of a free world. We Americans should welcome that diversity, for it is a fundamental principle of our own way of life.

THREAT OF SOVIET IMPERIALISM

A second serious obstacle to the building of an international community is, of course, the threat of Soviet imperialism. We have watched the Soviet design unfolding over the past 5 years. We see it at work, today, in many parts of the world, including the Far East, and we have been forced inescapably to the conclusion that it is hostile to the creation of a community of free nations. Its facade of Marxist communism has been clearly revealed as a mask for naked aggression.

The men in the Kremlin want to organize the world, to be sure. But they want to organize it on principles that civilized men have rejected and fought during hundreds of years. The Soviet principle is rule by absolute power, the power of a small group of men over other men, the power of one nation over other nations. The means of achieving this power are the police state, subversion, and concealed aggression.

We believe that we have learned how to meet that threat. We may not always be able to contain it at every point, but we are confident that we can not only contain but overcome it in time by a great cooperative effort of free men. We shall overcome it in the very act of building an international community so strong, so free, and so prosperous that all people will want to be a part of it, even those whose governments are now opposing it.

UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

But even if Western Europe had not suffered a temporary eclipse, even if the Soviet Union had been a strong and willing partner, we would still have had to deal with a third obstacle to the building of an international community. We would still have been faced with the fact that large areas of the world and hundreds of millions of people are not yet in a position to make their full contribution to the economic and political life of an international community.

I want to talk tonight about some of these areas, in South Asia, Africa, and the Near East, which constitute my special responsibility in the State Department. Although these areas have rich material resources and human potentialities, they are included in the "underdeveloped" regions of the world. This region contains almost 700 million people. It includes the great subcontinent of India and Pakistan, two nations which have only recently joined the international community as fully independent members. It includes the expanses of the Near East, with states as old as Greece and Iran and as young as Israel and Jordan. It includes also the continent of Africa, with its independent peoples of Liberia and Ethiopia and its numerous protectorates, colonies, and trust territories administered by European powers.

The people of this area practice five great religions: Islam, Christianity, Hinduism, Judaism, and Buddhism. They speak more than 145 languages. Much of what we now know and value in the realm of science, art, religion, and philosophy, we drew from their early cultures.

How can one generalize about an area so vast? If there is a common denominator among these lands and their peoples it is the fact that all have great potentialities which have not yet been realized. Another common characteristic of these people is their growing realization that they have not participated fully in the world's progress and their desire to make up for lost time.

Symbols of Progress

They have made substantial progress in terms of political independence, representative government, and personal freedom. In the period between the two world wars, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Iraq gained full independence. More recently, this area has given birth to nine other nations:

Syria, Lebanon, Israel, and Jordan in the Near East; India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and Burma in South Asia. Libya has been promised its independence by 1952 and Italian Somaliland within 10 years.

Political independence, however, is only one symbol of progress. It is not the only symbol. These people are beginning also to associate progress with a chance to better their lot in the world. They want better food, better housing, better schools, better health, and they are willing to make great efforts in order to obtain them. Although this new urge creates great dislocations and on occasion disappointments, it is on balance an encouraging development. It shows a growing understanding on the part of these peoples of their ability to help themselves. It shows a will to change. It is a force which, if used for constructive ends, can help achieve our objective of creating a stable international community.

Now what do these distant events mean to Americans? Do they affect our vital interests, and, if so, how should we shape our policies? Whenever these questions are asked of me, in one form or another, I think of the tragic and ironic remark that Neville Chamberlain made at the time of Munich, when he said, in a broadcast, that Czechoslovakia was a far-away country of which we knew little.

During the past year, I have visited almost all of the countries under discussion. The places and the peoples I have been describing may seem far away to you, and we Americans may still know little about them. But surely we know—or should know by now—that there is no corner of the world so remote that its fate cannot affect our own.

Community Problems on a Familiar Scale

But let us assume that our interest in these far-off peoples still needs to be demonstrated. Most of the states, I have mentioned, belong to the international community of which we have been speaking. Let us, by the convenient device of oversimplification, reduce this community problem to a familiar scale. Let us suppose that a comparable community problem existed in a city like Portland.

Suppose you could apply the term underdeveloped to two-thirds of the people of that city, which is about the proportion of peoples of underdeveloped areas to the population of the world as a whole. That figure would mean that two-thirds of the men, women, and children of Portland are now living in dire poverty, hunger, disease, and ignorance, amidst one-third that are enjoying all of the benefits of the good life in this beautiful city.

In this imaginary Portland, it would mean that among the citizens you would have an annual death rate of 28 per thousand, compared with 10 for the more favored citizens, although the birth rate would be 44 per thousand, rather than 26. Infant

mortality would be 153 per thousand live births, instead of 25. Deaths from tuberculosis might be as high as 283 per hundred thousand, instead of 33. These are figures from a representative part of the underdeveloped area.

More than eight out of ten adults in this group could not read or write. In other words, they would have an illiteracy rate of 80 percent instead of 3 percent. Their per capita income would be somewhere between 5 and 85 dollars a year, instead of the average American figure of 1,410 dollars. Suppose that the life expectancy of this two-thirds of Portland's population, instead of 63 years, were about 30 years; that, in other words, these particular citizens of Portland could expect to die when the rest of your citizens were approaching the most productive and useful years of their lives.

If you can imagine such a situation, I think you will agree that it would create a grave problem for the whole imaginary community of Portland. Indeed, the two-thirds would scarcely be convinced that the community as organized offered them adequate opportunities. They would have little incentive to support the community but would seek to change it or—failing that—to overthrow it by force. They would form an easy foil for troublemakers and agitators. The privileged one-third would, indeed, have an uneasy and insecure existence.

I have not talked about the underdeveloped lands of South Asia, Africa, and the Near East in terms of the Soviet threat, and I shall not do so. Communism in these particular areas is not an immediate danger. The problem in these areas is not to put out fires, since the sparks of communism have not found adequate fuel there. But communism may well become a threat if the growing aspirations of these peoples are frustrated. The problem is to help the peoples of these areas build a house that will be fireproof. And when we think of the time required for the building, we think in terms not of months or years but of decades.

What should our policies be toward these underdeveloped peoples? What type of assistance can we render them that is within our means and will be effective in meeting their particular problems?

Policies Toward Asia, Africa, and Near East

First, we must keep in mind that we are dealing with proud and independent peoples. In many instances, they are the direct inheritors of distinguished civilizations that provided the basis for our own more recent civilization. Their development will not take place along the same lines as ours. They must develop in their own way, and their way—for them—can be just as right as is our way—for us. The goals toward which they strive, although not always identical with ours, can assure them the same fullness of life and the

same opportunities to make a contribution to the world community as does ours.

In any event, they intend to shape their own future. Fortunately, that future is, today, in the hands of some great leaders, with whom we are working on a basis of mutual understanding and respect. Several of these leaders have only recently visited the United States at our invitation. We hope, increasingly, to convince them that our attitude toward them is friendly and disinterested; that we have no desire to dominate them, to enlist them in any "bloc" in pursuit of our own interests, or to force our economic system or ideologies upon them.

We must also not think of assistance as being, exclusively, in terms of financial aid. Indeed, I am afraid that we have, as a result of the highly successful European Recovery Program, which was basically financial in nature, come to attach too much importance to financial assistance and too much confidence in its ability to meet all problems. There are in the underdeveloped areas too many other limiting factors, too many other basic problems to be overcome to permit the useful expenditure of large amounts of capital in a short time, even if such funds existed in inexhaustible supply, which they do not. Dreams of a Tennessee Valley Authority for the Tigris-Euphrates Valley must await the achievement of less ambitious beginnings with smaller dams and works.

But beginnings must be made. Our efforts must begin where the people of the underdeveloped areas now are. We must help them with all the various means at our disposal—financial, technical, administrative, and moral assistance, to meet their basic problems in their way, to increase production of food, to provide better houses, better roads, schools, health, and public administration.

We know that we cannot offer them our own standards. We cannot, even within the city of Portland, guarantee absolute uniformity of living standards even though there is an opportunity for all people. We can, however, demonstrate our desire to assist by means of tangible evidence of progress. We can give these peoples hope which will provide the incentive to seek their future in continued cooperation with us and the other free nations of the world, within the framework of the United Nations.

What have we done so far? Is it enough?

FORMS OF U.S. ASSISTANCE

Apart from the magnificent work which our private organizations have carried on in these areas for many years, American aid has thus far been modest. It has taken a number of forms, in response to many diverse situations.

We have extended loans, through the Export-Import Bank, for development projects in Greece, Turkey, Egypt, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Afghanistan, Ethiopia, and Liberia. We have supported

loans to India and Iraq by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The European Recovery Program has enabled us to contribute, directly, to economic rehabilitation and development in Greece and Turkey and to economic development in the overseas territories of European nations in Africa. In Greece and Turkey, and now Iran, we have met special emergencies with a highly successful program of military aid, under the Mutual Defense Assistance Program.

We have, as you know, been carrying on a program for the exchange of teachers, students, and technicians of various kinds. We can now provide scholarships under Fulbright agreements with Greece, India, Burma, Egypt, Iran, and Turkey. We set great store by these exchange programs. We hope to extend them considerably.

Congress has now authorized the Point 4 Program of technical assistance, and we hope that appropriation will soon be made to permit that vital program to get under way. The area under discussion, which includes a large portion of the underdeveloped part of the world, was very much in President Truman's mind when he first announced his program of technical assistance.

UNITED NATIONS AID

From now on, a sizable part of our technical assistance will go forward through the United Nations and its specialized agencies. I want to mention just one of these projects which is now being put into operation. That is a United Nations program of relief and works projects for the Arab refugees from Palestine, for which the Congress has recently authorized an American contribution of about 27 million dollars.

This project grew out of a United Nations Economic Survey Mission headed by Gordon Clapp, Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I can give you no better statement of our policy toward the underdeveloped areas than by quoting from his report.

Higher living standards [says the introduction to this report] cannot be bestowed by one upon another like a gift. An improved economy does not come in a neat package sold or given away in the market place. A higher standard of living must grow out of the application of human skill and ingenuity to the physical resources of a country or region.

The highly developed nations of the world did not make their way by wishing. By work and risk they forced the earth, the soil, the forests and the rivers to yield them riches. They pooled their energy and resources by taxation and mutual enterprise to discover new ways of doing things. They worked, they invented, they educated and trained their children, and they invested in their national and in their private enterprises. This they must continue so to do, if they are to maintain the standard of living they have achieved.

There is no substitute for the application of work and local enterprise to each country's own resources. Help

to those who have the will to help themselves should be the primary policy guiding and restraining the desire of the more developed areas of the world to help the less developed lands.

This, I believe, is both an accurate and a realistic statement of our policies toward the peoples of the underdeveloped areas of the world. Our approach to these people, and it is a characteristically American approach, is on the level of partnership. We know that human progress cannot be bestowed; that it must grow out of cooperative effort; out of mutual respect. We know also that it can only be made to grow among those who have the will to help themselves.

Among the many who have that will and who look to us for cooperation, there is a natural impatience to get on with the job, a tendency to feel that the United States is not doing enough to assist the underdeveloped areas to play their part in the building of a community of free nations. Indeed, we must do so, since it is in our own vital interests to achieve this objective. We must make certain that we leave nothing undone that is within our capability to assure that other peoples are convinced that their own aspirations can best be served within the community of free nations. Only by so doing can we assure the realization of our own aspirations.

Support for an Expanded Information and Education Program

*Statement by Secretary Acheson*¹

I welcome warmly the action of Senator Benton and the 12 Senators² associated with him in introducing Senate Resolution 243, calling for "a greatly expanded program of information and education among all the peoples of the world to the full extent that they can be reached." The sponsors of this resolution have accurately diagnosed one of the elements not only vital but, in fact, indispensable to the conduct of American foreign relations today. We must make the truth known to the peoples of the world. This is a task that calls for greatly expanded and intensified efforts.

Truth in the world today is a political force. Nothing makes plainer the power of this force, I think, than the Communist fear of it. Behind the Iron Curtain, it has been said, "Truth is treason." We are familiar with the immense machinery of the police states for insuring that the words and acts of their citizens conform slavishly to the doctrines advocated publicly by their masters. That machinery has also, as one of its primary tasks, to exclude the truth, to suppress facts. Some of these facts seem to us curiously harmless, but once you begin to exclude the truth, to found your state on deliberately preserved ignorance and deliberately disseminated falsehood, even very simple facts have a potentially explosive force.

¹ Made before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on S. R. 243 on July 5 and released to the press on the same date.

² Submitted by Senator Benton on March 22 for himself and Senators Douglas, Flanders, Fulbright, Graham, Hendrickson, Lehman, McMahon, Morse, Mundt, Smith (Maine), Sparkman, and Tobey.

Communist States Fear Truth

The Communist states have not only shown their fear of truth by elaborate internal controls and policing. They have set up at their borders bars against free communication and free movement of men, books, ideas—against all the carriers of truth and information. They have pursued a policy of deliberate self-isolation. They are afraid to let their citizens look out, and they are afraid to let others look in. The recent demands that the United States close its information services in Rumania and Czechoslovakia are witnesses to the power of truth as a political force. So is the Soviet jamming of our radio broadcasts.

If totalitarian regimes cannot flourish where the truth is fully available, free and democratic countries cannot flourish unless their citizens do have access to the truth. The freedom of free nations grows out of the minds of its citizens. Free men make up their own minds, on the basis of free access to the truth, to the facts.

The growth of an international community of free and democratic nations depends upon the ready and free flow of facts, ideas, and people. Only this free flow of facts, ideas, and people can make clear the common bonds and interests of nations and allow them to settle their differences peaceably and justly.

International Communist propaganda has been engaged in a great campaign of falsification, distortion, suppression, and deception. We have had recently in Korea an illustration of the cruel deception being practiced by Communist propaganda on the universally felt desire for peace. Just a

few weeks before Communist armed forces launched their carefully planned attack across the 38th parallel, over half the population of North Korea was reported to have signed Communist-circulated petitions for peace. The cynical aggression of communism in Korea, and the falsehoods that have preceded and accompanied it, make inescapably clear the importance of the objectives in this proposed resolution.

This country has been a special target of the Communist campaign of falsehood and abuse. We have not been selected as a target simply because the Communists do not love us. The Communist effort to misrepresent and discredit the aims and nature of American life, and the aims and nature of American foreign policy, has primarily a great strategic value in the furtherance of Communist world objectives. This Communist campaign, therefore, jeopardizes the security of the United States and is a threat to the security of the free world.

Objectives of Communist Campaign

One of the strategic objectives of this Communist campaign is to divide the free world, whose unity is essential to its strength and essential to the elimination of Communist expansion.

Another is to confuse the world about the nature of democratic aspirations and ideals and to weaken the moral force and attraction of the free world.

Another is to spread deception about the free world's strength and resources, of every kind, and, thus, to weaken the free world's confidence in itself.

Another is to sow doubts regarding the free world's firmness of purpose, its determination to fulfill the international obligations it has accepted in the cause of freedom, and, thus, to produce irresolution, fear, and uncertainty.

So far as Communist efforts to foster falsehood about the United States are successful, they serve these Communist designs. They help to drive wedges between the United States and other countries, to create hesitancy, and to prevent clear, effective, unified resistance against Communist aims.

We must, therefore, make unmistakable the truth about the United States and the other free nations. In doing this, we will make plain the essential bond of common beliefs, and common interests that underlie differences in national customs and circumstances. We must make plain the facts of international relationships today, so that every man has an opportunity to make a true judgment on the immense issues and decisions that confront him. We must make plain the difference between Communist pretensions and Communist performance.

The President, in his address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 20,³ said,

Our task is to present the truth to the millions of people

who are uninformed or misinformed or unconvinced. Our task is to reach them in their daily lives, as they work and learn. We must be alert, ingenious, and diligent in reaching peoples of other countries, whatever their educational and cultural backgrounds may be. Our task is to show them that freedom is the way to economic and social advancement, the way to political independence, the way to strength, happiness, and peace.

... We must pool our efforts with those of the other free peoples in a sustained, intensified program to promote the cause of freedom against the propaganda of slavery. We must make ourselves heard round the world in a great campaign of truth.

The President directed me at that time "to plan a strengthened and more effective national effort to use the great power of truth in working for peace." In accordance with that directive, the Department of State has submitted to the President a plan for a broader and stronger program of information and education designed to carry out "a great campaign of truth," in the interest of a free and peaceful world. That plan is presently being considered by the President. It is dedicated to the achievement of the principles and purposes so clearly set forth in the proposed resolution.

Necessity for a Truth Campaign

The task of telling the truth, as the President has emphasized, is not "separate and distinct from other elements of our foreign policy. It is a necessary part of all we are doing to build a peaceful world." It is essential to the success of our foreign policy that the military, political, and economic measures we are taking be accompanied by an effective information program. The Marshall Plan, Point 4, military aid must be seen fully and truthfully in the widest context of the United States' hopes and aspirations. The facts about what we do, the facts about why we do it, the facts about the way we do it, are integral parts of what we do in foreign affairs.

We must remember in these efforts that the truth is a hard master.

We must always be on our guard against permitting what we say to outrun what we do. We must recognize that the more fully our principles are understood, the more closely our practice will be inspected. Our performance must not lag behind our principles. We must remember, too, that peoples speaking to peoples involves peoples listening to peoples. We must remember that the truth cannot be monopolized.

In the struggle for men's minds and men's allegiances, the free nations have great advantages. The truth is on their side. In addition, the free nations have developed to a high degree as integral parts of their free institutions, technical resources and skills for discovering the truth and

³ For a complete text of President's address, see BULLETIN of May 1, 1950, p. 669.

for telling the truth. The democratic concept has depended on the ability of every man to learn the truth and to act as an individual on the basis of it. Just as totalitarian states by their nature are equipped to suppress the truth, so the free nations are equipped by their nature to discover and disseminate it. These great resources, implicit in democratic life, must be utilized to the fullest. The emphasis placed in the sixth point of Senate Resolution 243 on the efforts of private American citizens seems to me to recognize this essential principle, and I welcome particularly this emphasis on private participation. Governments can do only a very small part of the task. It is the individual citizens, the private organizations, the independent groups, who make the major contribution to insuring that the truth is known.

There has never been a time when men everywhere who value freedom had a greater need to know the truth.

Senate Resolution 243

WHEREAS the struggle now raging between freedom and communism is a contest for the minds and loyalties of men; and

WHEREAS in such a struggle force and the threat of force do not change men's minds or win their loyalties; and

WHEREAS the real methods of Communist aggression are incessant and skillful propaganda designed to prepare the way for political infiltration, for sabotage, and for the consolidation of power by suppression and terror; and

WHEREAS these tactics have poisoned and continue to poison the minds of hundreds of millions throughout the world; and

WHEREAS we have learned that such Communist methods cannot be beaten back by arms and dollars alone but require world-wide offensive in behalf of the ideas which express our democratic principles and aspirations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States should initiate and vigorously prosecute a greatly expanded program of information and education among all the peoples of the world to the full extent that they can be reached—with a view to closing the mental gulf that separates the United

States from other peoples and that now blockades the universal hope for freedom and peace; be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that any such program should encompass, among other things—

(1) maintenance, through the United Nations and through our own diplomacy, of a steady and steadily increasing pressure in behalf of world-wide freedom of information;

(2) acceleration of the work of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to the point where, with effective leadership, it has a chance to make a significant, perhaps decisive, contribution to peace;

(3) development of the activities of the Offices of International Information and Educational Exchange in the Department of State, in the following ways among many others—

(a) preparation and execution of a comprehensive world-wide program to exhibit documentary and educational motion pictures designed to explain the democratic principles and ideals which underlie our foreign policy;

(b) significant and immediate expansion of our program for bringing foreign students to the United States;

(c) creation of a world broadcasting network capable of broadcasting on long wave, short wave, or medium wave, with an ultimate goal of reaching virtually every radio set in the world;

(d) use of any and all possible means to reach people who are shut off from the free world by censorship and suppression;

(4) promotion of democratic education abroad, notably in the occupied areas of Germany and Japan;

(5) convening of a conference of non-Communist nations now conducting international information programs, with a view to reaching a better understanding on common themes and on greatly increasing the effectiveness of the projection of such themes;

(6) encouragement of the establishment of a nongovernmental agency to help inspire and guide the efforts of the millions of private American citizens who might use their talents and resources and contacts overseas in furtherance of the programs and objectives of this resolution. and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the international propagation of the democratic creed be made an instrument of supreme national policy—by the development of a Marshall plan in the field of ideas.

Forging a Free World With a Truth Campaign

by Edward W. Barrett

*Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs*¹

Since the early 1940's, it has been apparent to the American people that a new era had arrived in world affairs—the era of the interdependence of nations, making international cooperation an imperative.

In order to defeat the Axis Powers in World War II, we discovered that we had to pool our physical and moral resources with those of our Allies and organize a high command to direct our collective effort. And by reaching the minds of the enemy peoples, we weakened their resolution and brought peace nearer.

Along with other free nations, we realized while the fighting was still going on that voluntary collaboration would also be required to deal with the problems of the postwar world. We agreed that intensive information activities would be needed to mobilize the support of the peoples of the world in a determined effort to rebuild shattered economies, to extend human freedoms, and to avert a recurrence of war. We joined in the establishment of the United Nations, only to see the United Nations—despite its great accomplishments—deprived of the power to safeguard world peace by the peculiar tactics of the Soviet Union. We found that the struggle between tyranny and freedom was still going on. The only difference was that the enemies of freedom were using not guns but threats of war, political and economic pressures on weaker countries, and the subversive activities of fifth columnists in every land, including our own.

I doubt very much whether the United States has ever faced a more difficult and perilous world situation than now, even allowing for the events in recent weeks which have signaled a forward leap in the collective strength of the free nations at the expense of Soviet imperialist ambitions.

The world situation is still precarious. This is no time to be baselessly undermining public confidence in those to whom the all-important conduct of our foreign policy is entrusted.

But, unfortunately, we still have with us those who are perfectly willing to undermine confidence in the United States at home and abroad for cheap political reasons, who do not hesitate to make loose charges first and search for evidence later, who resort to reckless smear tactics. However, it is heartening to know that at Washington there are many, many more men of both parties who have submerged political rivalries in the field of foreign affairs—men, for example, like Herbert Lehman and John Foster Dulles, to cite but two from this State. Such men are working devotedly, and without headlines, to strengthen their Government in the international field, to help their Government in the difficult job of eliminating any possible security risks, and to help devise ever stronger international policies for their Government. We should bow to such fine decent public servants who realize there is a limit to politics. It is because of them that the damage done by selfish irresponsibles is now being repaired. The passage by the Congress of the full foreign aid bill while Secretary Acheson was in Europe, for the recent London meetings, gave an impressive demonstration that a unified America is still backing up a consistent line of policy. The strong pleas by leaders of both of our major political parties for increased two-party collaboration in the making and the carrying out of our policy has also had a salutary effect at home and abroad. The signs point clearly now to a renewed, indeed intensified, bipartisan policy, enabling us to cooperate with our friends abroad to even better effect.

Building a Community of Free Nations

Certainly there is no mistaking either the need for the closer association of the Atlantic pact na-

¹ An address made at Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson, N.Y., on June 17 and released to the press on the same date.

tions or the real progress that is being made in that direction. The agreements reached by the North Atlantic Treaty Council at London show that the powerful democracies of this Atlantic area are forging a true community of free nations. Through the increasing coordination of their military, moral, economic, and political strength, they are reducing the likelihood of war and bringing nearer the day when at least the majority of the world's peoples can realize the goals of the United Nations Charter.

So far as it is within our power to prevent them, there are two things that we must not allow to occur—that is, for the industrial complex of Western Europe to fall into the grip of the Soviet Union or for any more of the potentially great nations of Asia and the Far East to suffer that fate. If either happened, our hopes for a free world society would be set back. If both happened, so far as we were concerned, the ballgame would be over.

Those two eventualities are precisely what the Soviet Union is aiming for, and precisely what we and our friends are determined shall not take place.

There is no need for me to review now the vigorous actions which we are taking in concert with the nations of Western Europe to shatter the Soviet ambitions. We believe we can make Soviet aggression too hazardous to be risked. We seek to render Soviet subversion ineffective by building up economic, social, and political stability.

In the Far East and Asia, as you know, we have respected and supported movements toward national independence. We encourage emerging new nations to prove to themselves that only democracy—in the words of Nehru—can “deliver the goods, materially and spiritually,” and by direct aid, support their efforts toward advancement. Now that China has fallen under the control of Moscow, an already delicate political situation has worsened. We must act wisely and firmly in helping to prevent the further spread of communism among the Asian millions. As a newcomer in government, I feel we are doing so.

In Europe, in Asia, and the Far East, in other world areas, we must continue to act positively wherever freedom is in danger for our own freedom is at stake.

Truth as a Tool for Freedom

I am especially concerned with the positive action of supplying truth and promoting mutual understanding. My job, in the State Department, is to see that we do not neglect the vitally important factor of world public opinion in our international relations. The description of the so-called “cold war” as a contest to win the minds of men has been worked to death, but it remains a decisive guidepost for shaping our policies and actions.

In his recent address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, President Truman cut to the heart of the matter. He said:

The cause of freedom is being challenged throughout the world today by the forces of imperialist communism. . . . Deceit, distortion, and lies are systematically used by them as a matter of deliberate policy. . . .

We cannot run the risk that nations may be lost to the cause of freedom because their people do not know the facts.

It is hard for me to conceive that anyone in this day could question the need for us to reach into every nation in the world with a barrage of truthful information about the kind of people we are, how we really live, and what our intentions are toward other peoples. It is surely self-evident that we must make the citizens of other free nations understand that we have a real community of interests and that we must pull together if we are to have a world in which a decent kind of life is possible.

It may sound dry as dust to us, but the clear explanation of United States foreign policy and the views of our leading statesmen and of the American people on the world situation are of the liveliest interest to people abroad. The more we reach people abroad with that kind of factual information, the better our prospects of pulling together in the common cause of freedom. We are building mutual trust and understanding on the only basis on which they can be built—that of knowledge of the facts as they exist. Any man who really knows what is going on is a long way toward knowing what to do about it.

The power of the simple, unadulterated truth is precisely our answer to the distortions of Communist propaganda, and I, for one, am confident that if we hit with the truth hard enough, long enough, and on a sufficient scale—and that means no less than a world-wide scale—we can make the Communist propaganda start backfiring not only outside the Iron Curtain but inside it as well. I do not want to make it sound easy; it is not. It is a terrific and arduous job, but it is one that we must get done—through both public and private channels.

I believe that we must intensify greatly our efforts along these lines. In the Department of State, we are now completing a thorough study and analysis of the complete range of our informational, educational, and cultural exchange programs to appraise the results we are getting and to discover ways of getting better results. We are very eager to measure up to what the President recently described as the need for a great new “campaign of truth.”

Meanwhile, we have encouraging evidence that we are accomplishing something very worthwhile in what we are now doing through the world-wide broadcasts of the Voice of America, the daily Morse code transmission of official texts and information to missions abroad for public release, the showing of documentary films and photographic displays, the services of libraries and information centers open to the general public, the legwork of public affairs and information and

cultural officers of the Foreign Service, and our practice of bringing students, teachers, laborers, and professional people to the United States so and they can go back home with first-hand information about American democracy.

Very briefly, I would like to give you a few highlights which will suggest the promise this type of activity offers.

The radio Voice of America is now operating on a 24-hour schedule, with a total of 70 daily programs in 24 languages. About 30,000 words are beamed out daily in news reports, commentaries and news analyses, and features on American life. It is impossible to be accurate about how many people we are reaching with this international radio network, but we estimate our potential listening audience at 300 million people. We do have one solid basis of measurement—letters from listeners. In 1949, excluding the Iron Curtain countries, the Voice received from abroad around 10,000 letters a month. The number has now increased to a monthly rate of 25,000. I think that is impressive evidence of the impact which the Voice is making.

A German recently wrote the Voice in colorful English as follows:

Having just returned from Russian captivity, I wish to inform you that I have experienced in Russia that your transmissions in Russian language are paid attention to and that the Russians like very much to listen in for them.

Even the officials of the Ministry of National Security occupied in our camps sent off the prisoners of war whom they were trying at 9 o'clock in order to hear the Voice of America. Next day the party men of course assured one another that it was a big twaddle what they had told on the Voice of America—but they heard it every one!

From many sources, we are able to piece together bits of information which add up to this: That we are still reaching a hard core—a substantial core—of listeners in the Soviet Union. There are many Russian citizens whose experience in slave labor camps and the like have left them with little fondness for the Communist dictatorship. We are reaching them with the truth about what is going on in the outside world, and I think it is most unlikely that what they are learning stops with them. They are surely passing it on through the grapevine to be found in any land smothered by oppression and denied access to news of the outside world. There is always a great hunger for news where it has been arbitrarily cut off. This is our opportunity to keep alive, even in Russia, the possibility of ultimate cooperation between our people and a free Russian people. Meanwhile, the more we reach the Russian people with honest news, the more we force the Russian dictators to beware of an explosion within if they step too far in their adventures abroad.

Soviet Reaction

Probably the best measure of the impact of the Voice is the case of jitters it seems to have instilled

in the men in the Kremlin. As you know, the wholesale Russian jamming operation which began April 24, 1949, is still going on 24 hours a day. In devoting several hundred Soviet transmitters to this jamming operation, the Soviet Government is spending more money to keep our broadcasts out than we are spending on our entire world-wide Voice operations. You know, too, that we have long had engineers devising methods of breaking through the jamming. That costs money, and the Congress voted it—11.5 million dollars. We are now getting through the jamming on a scale which is still less than can satisfy us but is enough to keep the Soviet rulers acutely uncomfortable. We mean to make them more so. I can now announce that, as a result of recent frantic Russian attempts to shut us out of Czechoslovakia, we are today doubling our Voice of America output in the Czech and Slovak languages. We shall not let them shut out the truth as long as we can help it. The more we can keep the Russian bear busy scratching his own fleas, the less likely he is to molest the rest of the world.

The jamming of the Voice is by no means the only evidence of the fear of all the Iron Curtain governments of having their peoples reached by truthful information. Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Communist China have adopted oppressive tactics to prevent people from listening to our broadcasts, such as heavy fines, imprisonment, and confiscation of the radios of those caught listening. For an extreme example, on April 22, 1950, a Hungarian court at Gyor sentenced Agoston Rohring, Jr., to death on charges of hiding arms and of listening—in the words of the court “to the United States imperialistic radio which incites to war.” Nevertheless, a Hungarian-born United States citizen, who returned March 27 from a visit in Hungary, said he did not speak with anyone who did not eagerly await the daily VOA broadcast, despite the severe punishment they would face if detected.

We are now witnessing a systematic campaign to black-out our information activities entirely in the Iron Curtain countries. Most of our information centers have been shut down in the Iron Curtain countries or so cramped by Governmental edicts as to render them practically useless. The Iron Curtain is seeking daily to increase the isolation of the peoples within from any and all healthy contacts with the outer world. This development points all the more emphatically to the importance of the Voice broadcasts and the value of increasing its power. Foy Kohler, who returned last year from long duty in Moscow to head up the Voice, said recently that he would like to see an expanded Voice of America which could reach loud and clear throughout the world in all languages. I go along with him in that, and I agree that it would be worth to us every cent it would cost. That cost, incidentally, would amount annually to about the cost of 6 minutes of the kind of shooting war which we financed in World War II.

Other Measures of Strength

I would like to highlight another way in which we are cultivating understanding between ourselves and other peoples and correcting misconceptions about the American people and our way of life which are circulated abroad. I refer to our educational exchange and exchange of persons programs, under which we bring to this country a great number of foreign teachers, officials, editors, industrialists, labor leaders, students, and people from other walks of life. We welcome every opportunity to enable these visitors to move freely among us, to work and study with us, to see the bad with the good, and then go back to their own lands to report on what they have seen and learned. I would like to see this program expanded until we had a stream of visitors from every country in the world. As an illustration of the importance of this activity, there are now 5,000 Chinese students studying in American schools and universities and learning about us while living among us. Most of them will probably go back to China, where they can potentially serve as a potent corrective to the attacks now being made on us by the Communist regime. I ask you to ask yourselves only one question: What would we not give to have an equal number of Soviet students live among us and then go back to their own land to report on what they had seen?

The simple, unadulterated truth that we are

trying to get across to the citizens of other countries is that the United States is pursuing a genuine policy of peace. We are spending billions and sending thousands of our ablest people abroad to assist other nations in solving their difficulties, so that they may join their growing strength with ours in creating a world free of war, free of political oppression, and free of economic or any other form of human slavery. As a result of what we and other free nations are accomplishing together, we are beginning to see new horizons in international understanding, the light of the day in which the peoples of the world will have what they want—a world in which the diversity of human skills and the force of human energies can be concentrated on lifting standards of living, materially and spiritually, throughout civilization.

I think that there is no higher purpose to which you could give your support. As American citizens, you have the opportunity to make your influence felt by supporting these ultimate aims of American policy. We cannot remind ourselves too often that the Voice of America is the collective voice of this nation. You are a part of that voice.

We can eventually forge a world of decency, of freedom, and of peace if we push ahead, if we boldly use the great weapons of economics and truth at our command—and if we keep our heads and use our heads.

Analysis of Senator McCarthy's Public Statements

MILWAUKEE SPEECH

The Department of State on June 17 made public¹ the following analysis of some of the factual inaccuracies in the speech delivered by Senator McCarthy at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, to the Republican State Convention of Wisconsin on June 9, 1950.

Several misstatements which Senator McCarthy made at Milwaukee, he has repeated since in his speech of June 15 at New London, Connecticut, to the convention of the National Editorial Association. In particular, he repeated at New London the first misstatement dealt with here—Senator McCarthy's perversion of the record of Secretary Acheson's position in the matter of the loan to Poland. The actual record of the Senate Committee which explored this matter is set forth in this release. He has also since repeated his assertions—which are here once again shown false—about United States policy with regard to Poland and China and about State Department files.

¹ Department of State press release 648.

1. SENATOR McCARTHY SAID: From October 1945, to March of 1947, Acheson's law firm was retained by the Communist government of Poland to obtain a 90 million-dollar loan from the United States. The loan was put through and Acheson's firm received a fee of over 50 thousand dollars, according to Acheson's sworn testimony. During this time, Acheson was Assistant Secretary. . . . He admitted in January 1949, that he was charged with responsibility of making that loan! Fifty million of that 90 million went to equip and arm the Communist army and the dreaded . . . Communist secret police . . . It was Mr. Acheson who placed the guns, the whips, the black-snakes, and the clubs in the hands of those Communists. [and] . . . who furnished them with bullets to keep a Christian population under Soviet discipline . . .

THE FACTS: This charge, with its innuendoes, is utterly false and based on a deliberate distortion of the public record. The circumstances of the loan to Poland were carefully scrutinized by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in January 1949, prior to the confirmation of Mr. Acheson's nomi-

nation as Secretary of State. The Committee's hearings established that Mr. Acheson had severed all connections with his former law firm 5 years before the Polish loan was approved by the Department of State; that he acted on the loan only after it had been recommended by the various divisions of the Department, including Will Clayton's economic divisions and the political divisions; and that the Department, at that time, still had hopes that the Mikolajczyk government, then in power in Poland, might be saved from Russian domination.

Any person really desiring the facts would carefully have examined the record of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The entire published record of this Committee's hearings dealing with this question is set forth below:

The Chairman: There have been charges over the radio that there was some activity by that firm [Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb] with regard to a Polish loan while you were in the State Department. Can you tell us about that?

Mr. Acheson: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I shall be glad to do that.

The Chairman: I assume, of course, that while you were in the State Department you had severed your relationships with the firm as far as the receipt of any portion of their revenues as compensation.

Mr. Acheson: On the 1st of February 1945 [subsequently corrected to February 1, 1941], when I took the oath as Assistant Secretary of State, I severed all connection of any sort with my firm. The interest which I had in it was valued, computed, and paid to me by the firm, and I had no further connection with it until I returned to private practice on July 1, 1947.

The Chairman: Was your name dropped from the firm?

Mr. Acheson: My name was not dropped from the title of the firm. It was dropped from the list of partners who were connected with the firm. The name and style of the firm remained the same.

The Chairman: Like many firms, they wanted the firm name to go on, as I understand.

Mr. Acheson: That was the desire of my partners, a desire in which I acquiesced.

The Chairman: But on the list of attorneys in the firm, your name was not included?

Mr. Acheson: Certainly not.

Senator Wiley: You had no financial interest in it?

Mr. Acheson: No, sir.

The Chairman: You were starting to tell us about the charge with respect to the Polish loan in which your firm, while you were in office, had some unusual interest. Tell us about that.

Mr. Acheson: This matter, Mr. Chairman, was a matter which was begun and finished at a time when I had no connection with the firm whatever. In October 1945, the Polish Supply Mission employed the senior partner of that firm, Mr. Edward B. Burling, and some of his associates, to work with that Supply Mission in the drafting of contracts, papers, and so forth, having to do with a loan which the Supply Mission wished to make with the Export-Import Bank. That work continued from Octo-

ber 1945 until March 1947. It consisted in drawing up in legal form various conditions which were to be imposed to the granting of that loan. After the loan was granted and approved by the Export-Import Bank, there were various legal documents having to do with the nature of the payment and repayment, in which the firm assisted. After the loan began to be paid out, there were contracts which were made between the Polish Supply Mission and various suppliers in the United States. The firm assisted in that matter.

In March 1947, after the President of the United States made a strong statement of disapproval of the activities of the Polish Government, the firm notified the Polish Supply Mission that they were no longer at its service.

It has been stated somewhat extravagantly that the firm received in the neighborhood of a million dollars for its services. Its services for the period October 1945 to March 1947 were paid for on the basis of the time of the various people engaged in it, and the total fee was 50,175 dollars.

The Chairman: And not a million?

Mr. Acheson: No, sir; it was not that.

I think it would be appropriate at this point, in view of the charges that I had something to do with the granting of this loan, which was of benefit to a firm with which I had been connected, to state the facts in regard to that matter. The Polish Supply Mission and the Polish Government approached the United States in 1945 for two credits. One was a credit of 40 million dollars to be used for the purchase of coal cars. The other was a credit of 50 million dollars to be used for the purchase of surplus supplies owned by the United States and located in Europe. The matter of this loan was discussed in the State Department for sometime and was also discussed with the Secretary of State, who was in Europe. It was discussed in 1945 and 1946.

On April 24, 1946, at a time when I was Acting Secretary of State, the various divisions of the State Department, including the economic ones under Mr. Clayton and the political ones under the political officers, recommended that these credits should be granted on certain conditions. That recommendation was approved by me, and on April 24, 1946, a release was given stating what the conditions were and stating an exchange of notes between the Polish Government and the Government of the United States.

Subsequently, some of the conditions imposed were, in the opinion of the Government of the United States, not fulfilled by the Government of Poland, and again, as Acting Secretary of State, I suspended the loan until those conditions were met.

A matter which was not stated as a condition of the loan, but was a consideration which entered into the making of it, was that there should be free elections in Poland. Those elections were held. They were not regarded by the State Department or by the President of the United States as free elections. The President made a statement on that subject, and so did I. However, since this matter was not a condition to the loan, the loan was not again suspended.

The consideration which led to the granting of 40 million dollars for the purchase of coal cars was the great necessity of supplying Polish coal to western Europe.

That coal is now being supplied in very substantial quantities with the use of these cars.

The Chairman: May I ask you one question: Did your former firm have any relation whatever to the policy matters that were determined or was it purely a legal arrangement about these contracts and drafting of the instruments that were necessary to bring about the loan?

Mr. Acheson: It was purely a legal matter, Mr. Chairman. The firm had nothing to do with the question of whether or not the loan should be granted.

The Chairman: That is what I had in mind.

Senator Vandenberg: At that point, Mr. Acheson, was it the policy of the Government to make the loans subject to these suspensions and reservations that you have indicated?

Mr. Acheson: That was correct, Senator Vandenberg.

Senator Vandenberg: Would these be the instructions also to our Ambassador at Warsaw?

Mr. Acheson: I do not think I understand that question.

Senator Vandenberg: To come right down to the bare bones of it, why would there then be a dispute, or an alleged dispute, between the American Ambassador at Warsaw, in respect to this thing and our representatives in Paris?

Mr. Acheson: There was throughout the consideration of this loan a difference of opinion between the American Ambassador in Warsaw and the officers of the State Department, including the Secretary and myself, who were charged with responsibility in it. That was a difference of view. It was one in which the unanimous opinion of the officers of the State Department was on one side and the Ambassador took a different view.

It has been stated, and I have seen it in the press, that the Ambassador resigned on account of this loan. That is not the fact. The loan was made on the 24th of April 1946. The Ambassador resigned on the 31st of March 1947.

Senator Vandenberg: Was this Polish Government, which your firm represented in this connection, what we would call a satellite government or was it still a government which pretended—at least, through the cooperation of Mikolajczyk—to still be, in pretense at least, a coalition government?

Mr. Acheson: It was the latter, Senator Vandenberg. This was the Mikolajczyk government, and there was, during that period, a hope that it might in some respects be free from complete Russian domination.

Senator Wiley: I want to make an inquiry. I understand, Mr. Acheson, that you claim that you yourself, personally, in no way profited from this transaction that your firm had; that at the time that the firm was engaged by the Government of Poland you had no legal or financial interest in the firm; that you had really stepped out from it; is that correct?

Mr. Acheson: That is correct, Senator.

Senator Wiley: And never since have you received any remuneration from this transaction?

Mr. Acheson: That is correct, Senator.

Senator Smith: Mr. Chairman, might I ask another question in that connection?

The Chairman: Yes.

Senator Smith: Mr. Acheson, I understood you to say that in February 1945, when you became Under Secretary

of State, you severed your connection with the firm. I also understood you to say that prior to that time, in 1944, if I have the figures correct, you were Assistant Secretary of State in other matters in the State Department. Were you an active member of your law firm during that period?

Mr. Acheson: No, Senator. You misunderstood me, I think. What I believe I said was that on the 1st of February 1941 I entered the service of the Government. At that time, I severed all connection with my firm and did not reestablish any connection with it whatever until July 1947, when I returned to private life.

Senator Smith: Thank you. That is what I wanted to bring out. I was not quite clear about that.

Senator Tydings: I think you said in your direct testimony that at one time this loan was suspended. Is that correct?

Mr. Acheson: That is correct, Senator Tydings.

Senator Tydings: At that time, was your former law firm still representing the Polish Government?

Mr. Acheson: Yes, sir; that is correct.

Senator Tydings: Then it seems to be an inference that the steps and your part in the suspension of the Polish loan were adverse to the interests of your law firm. Is that correct?

Mr. Acheson: That is correct, Senator Tydings.

Senator Tydings: I would like to ask you now if the first name in your firm does not represent the name of a man who is deceased, Mr. Harry Covington.

Mr. Acheson: That is true.

Senator Tydings: Isn't it a matter of fact that when a law firm is organized, in a matter of law, and any member dies or withdraws from the firm, that in the nature of the partnership the goodwill of the name itself, even though a member leaves the firm, the remaining partners can continue to keep his name as a part of the firm?

Mr. Acheson: That is true, Senator Tydings. It is a very common practice.

Senator Tydings: I think it is supported by numerous cases in the court.

Mr. Acheson: I should believe so.

Senator Tydings: Where a man leaves a law firm, the remaining partners are entitled to the goodwill created by the old name, and in case of death the same thing applies. It belongs to the partnership and not to the individual once the goodwill label is created. Is that correct?

Mr. Acheson: I believe so. I can't answer authoritatively. I have not looked it up.

Senator Tydings: During the negotiations between the State Department and the Polish Government concerning this loan, did your law partners at any time talk to you about the loan or urge its rejection, adoption, modification, or alteration?

Mr. Acheson: No, Senator. I had no conversation with any of them of any sort.

Senator Tydings: Then, when you severed your connection with your law firm as you have stated, during the time you filled the Government position, none of your partners or associates in your office in any manner, shape, or form contacted you to assist them in work that was in

the office that might also have some connection in the State Department; is that correct?

Mr. Acheson: That is correct, Senator.

As I can recall it, and I think my memory is clear, in the 6½ years in which I was in the State Department I had one call from one member of that firm and that was to tell me that a client that he represented, who was an exporter of materials, would like to know whether the State Department would be pleased if that firm ceased exporting materials to Japan. I told him that the State Department would indeed be pleased at that action and that action was taken, and I believe that is the only conversation on any matter of business which I had with any one of my partners in 6½ years.

Senator Tydings: That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Vandenberg: Do you think there is any chance for public misunderstanding through the retention, let us say, of the name of the Secretary of State in the title of a law firm?

Mr. Acheson: I should think that there might very easily be, and it will be my recommendation to my partners that they would please me very much, and I think serve themselves, by dropping my name from the title of the firm. [The firm name now is Covington, Burling, Rublee, O'Brian and Shorb.]

2. SENATOR McCARTHY SAID: I pointed out to the Senate 4 days ago that some of those men who the FBI listed as Soviet agents are still working in the State Department shaping our foreign policy at this very moment.

THE FACTS: What Senator McCarthy actually had said to the Senate 4 days before was that:

At least three of those listed as Communist agents by the FBI 3 years ago are still holding high positions in the State Department. . . . Those names I have checked and I know the persons are working in the State Department. . . . I . . . have the proof that those men are working in the State Department as of this very moment.

Instead of proof, Senator McCarthy now produces a watered-down version of his previous charge, which the Department also refuted in its statement of June 9.

In his speech to the Senate, Senator McCarthy further stated that the names of the three so-called "agents" still in the Department were also among the 106 submitted by him to the Tydings Subcommittee. In actuality, of a total of 20 persons hypothesized on the chart as "agents," there is only one who—after thorough reinvestigation, including a full FBI investigation, and clearance under the Department's loyalty and security procedures—is still in the employ of the Department. That one does not hold a "high position." His grade is GS-9. Furthermore, that one is not on the list of 106 which Senator McCarthy gave the Subcommittee.

3. SENATOR McCARTHY SAID: (Immediately after asserting that "untouchables" in the State Department were plotting the "Communitic enslavement of the world" and that the Administration was protecting "Communists

and traitors in Government"): As an example, I would like to give you the complete case proven on Dr. Philip Jessup, the State Department's Ambassador-at-Large. . . . This is the man who, under the guidance of Lattimore, is determining to a large extent our Far Eastern policy. . . . The documentary evidence shows that Jessup belonged to five organizations which had been officially declared as fronts for and doing the work of the Communist Party . . .

THE FACTS: On the Senate floor on June 6, and under the protection of his Senatorial immunity, Senator McCarthy had gone even farther—he virtually said that Ambassador Jessup was a member of the Communist Party:

Their [The Communist Party's] top aim was to get some of their members on that Executive Committee [of the Institute of Pacific Relations], to control that. For example, we find Frederick V. Field, we find Philip C. Jessup, and Harriet Moore, a very well-known Communist.

Ambassador Jessup, in his testimony before the Tydings Subcommittee, demonstrated the complete falsity of Senator McCarthy's allegations, and the Department has repeatedly set forth the facts—particularly in its analysis, on May 28,² of Senator McCarthy's May 25 speech at Rochester, New York, and of the various documents which he presented at that time as "evidence."

4. SENATOR McCARTHY SAID: So far, those who object to our methods in this present fight have offered as their only alternative that we go back to the method used for the past 16 years during which the Communists have been permitted to take control of our State Department, infiltrate our Government, and work with the Soviet Union to accomplish the two major Russian aims:

1. To create a Red China; and
2. To create a Red Poland.

THE FACTS: The Department of State has strenuously objected to the methods adopted by Senator McCarthy. The objection stems from the irresponsible and destructive approach which the Senator has seen fit to adopt in his attacks. The Department has actively solicited constructive suggestions and criticism from the Congress, private organizations, and individual citizens regarding the conduct of our foreign relations, so that the policies of the Department may be as representative of the best thinking of the American people as possible. Senator McCarthy's repeated misstatements concerning the Department and its policies obviously do not fall into this category.

In Poland, the Department did everything in its power to bring about free elections and the establishment of an independent democratic government. That this effort so far has been unsuccessful is strictly attributable to the realities of the situation which Senator McCarthy deliberately ignores; viz., the geographic proximity of Poland and the Soviet Union combined with the political

² BULLETIN of June 19, 1950, p. 1013.

blackjack of scores of Red divisions in and around Polish territory. Soviet intransigence left the United States Government only the alternative of force which even Senator McCarthy, under the circumstances, might hesitate to recommend.

In China, the United States Government poured out billions of dollars for economic, fiscal, and military assistance of the anti-Communist forces. This effort was frustrated by the fact that there ultimately ceased to exist in China any political entity with the organic integrity and determination to combat communism on a scale which would make further support practical and effective.

5. SENATOR MCCARTHY SAID: For nearly 20 years we have allowed dilettante diplomats to do the "fighting" for us with kid gloves in perfumed drawing rooms . . .

THE FACTS: The members of the United States Foreign Service are drawn from all States of the Union and from all walks of life. Angus Ward, Consul General in China, for almost a year imprisoned with his staff of 18 by the Chinese Communists, saw none of Senator McCarthy's imaginary perfumed drawing rooms. He and his people suffered real hardship in real risk of their lives. Departmental observers were frequently under fire during the Greek civil war and similarly exposed in the war between the Israeli and the Arabs for Palestine. Consul General Thomas Wasson was killed by a sniper at Palestine in 1948. Officers assigned to certain posts in Southeast Asia are required by Departmental order to carry firearms for their personal protection. Out of some 8,000 officers in the Foreign Service, about 2,000 are veterans. Senator McCarthy is simply repeating, here, frayed clichés based on ignorance or malice.

6. SENATOR MCCARTHY SAID: This letter [from the Secretary of State to Representative Sabath] shows that the Department insisted on hiring 205 individuals who had been declared unfit . . . by the President's own Security and Loyalty Board . . . I told him [the President] I had the names of 57 individuals whose files would indicate that they were with Communists or loyal to the Party . . . My continual investigation has increased that list to 81 . . . I have given them 25 more names, totaling 106 . . . The FBI gave the State Department a detailed chart . . . showing that there were a total of 124 . . . 2 months later 106 . . . were still working in the Department . . .

THE FACTS: At Wheeling, West Virginia, on February 9, 1950, Senator McCarthy asserted in a Lincoln Day address:

. . . While I cannot take the time to name all the men in the State Department who have been named as active members of the Communist Party and members of a spy ring, I have here in my hand a list of 205—a list of names that were made known to the Secretary of State as being members of the Communist Party and who nevertheless are still working and shaping policy in the State Department.

The next day, he said he had the names of "57 card-carrying members of the Communist Party" allegedly working in the Department. Later, he talked in terms of 81 security risks of various sorts. Then, he said he would stand or fall on his ability to prove that there was one "top espionage agent" in the State Department. Recently, he has directed his attention to the Civil Service clearances, 7 years ago, of two Chinese for Office of War Information employment. Reverting to his numbers game, he now injects a new "106," paired with another big "3."

To date, Senator McCarthy has utterly failed to prove that there is a single Communist or pro-Communist in the State Department.

7. SENATOR MCCARTHY SAID: He [President Truman] announced that he would make available not all of the files, but the loose-leaf, raped, and denuded State Department files in some of the cases—files which, according to a House Committee report based on an FBI survey, had been extensively tampered with.

THE FACTS: Here, Senator McCarthy dishes up once again a previous assertion already refuted by the Department—most recently in its May 25 analysis³ of the Senator's May 15 speech in Atlantic City.

As the Department then pointed out, these files are now as rigidly controlled, accurate, and complete as it is possible to make them. The files delivered to the Subcommittee are complete files—State Department reports, FBI reports, interrogations, hearings, administrative memoranda, even pencilled working papers—everything. On May 10, when the Committee started examining the files, Senator Tydings is quoted as having said:

These 81 files contain not only all of the data which the State Department investigators have assembled, but also all of the loyalty data which the FBI has gathered and referred to the State Department and which has been made a part of these files.

Thus the Committee will have the complete record from all sources . . .

8. SENATOR MCCARTHY SAID: It is the Lattimore-Acheson plan for Soviet conquest of the Pacific . . . This is what he [Owen Lattimore] says . . . This . . . by the architect of our State Department Far Eastern policy . . . Lattimore's master plan . . . bought lock, stock and barrel by Acheson . . . The Lattimore-Acheson axis served the purpose of the Kremlin . . .

THE FACTS: Both the State Department and Mr. Lattimore himself have repeatedly reiterated the falsity of these assertions. Mr. Lattimore is not an employee of the State Department and is not the "architect" of its Far Eastern policy. Senator Tydings asked Secretaries Hull, Byrnes, Marshall, and Acheson⁴ whether such a characterization of

³ BULLETIN of June 12, 1950, p. 968.

⁴ BULLETIN of June 12, 1950, p. 972.

Mr. Lattimore was true or false. They all replied that it was false.

9. SENATOR McCARTHY SAID: "This is the Acheson who reinstated and put in charge of personnel in the Far East, John Stewart Service . . ."

THE FACTS: The following letters from the then Secretary of State, Mr. James F. Byrnes, and former Undersecretary Joseph C. Grew clearly set forth the circumstances of Mr. Service's reinstatement to the Foreign Service—by Secretary Byrnes on the recommendation of the Foreign Service Personnel Board:

August 14, 1945

MY DEAR MR. SERVICE: I am advised that the Grand Jury, after hearing the testimony of witnesses, has found nothing to warrant an indictment against you.

One of the fundamentals of our democratic system is the investigation by a Grand Jury of criminal charges. By that process you have been cleared.

I am advised that at the time of your arrest you were placed on leave of absence with pay. I am happy to approve the recommendation of the personnel board that you be returned to active duty. You have now been reassigned to duty in the Department for important work in connection with Far Eastern Affairs.

I congratulate you on this happy termination of your ordeal and predict for you a continuance of the splendid record I am advised you have maintained since first you entered the Foreign Service.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES

August 14, 1945

DEAR SERVICE: The Secretary has just told me of the letter he has written you expressing his pleasure at your complete vindication. I just want to add a personal word of my own.

When I learned, only a few days before your arrest, that your name had been coupled with thefts of official documents I was inexpressibly shocked. Having known you for some time and of the high calibre of your work I could not believe that you could be implicated in such an affair. As the Secretary has stated, you have been completely cleared of any such imputation by operation of our democratic machinery of investigation and law enforcement.

I am particularly pleased that you are returning to duty in the field of your specialization, Far Eastern Affairs, where you have established an enviable record for integrity and ability.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. GREW

Mr. Service has never been in charge of personnel in the Far East. At the end of 1948, Mr.

Service was assigned to the Department in line with the established policy of rotating Foreign Service officers and bringing back to the United States those who, like Mr. Service, have spent considerable time in the field. For 3 months in 1949, Mr. Service served on the Foreign Service Selection Board, which includes public as well as governmental members. The Board recommends promotions throughout the Foreign Service, but it does not deal with assignment and is not in charge of field personnel in the Far East or anywhere else. During the remainder of his Washington assignment, in 1949, Mr. Service served as a special assistant in the Division of Foreign Service Personnel but had nothing to do with appointments or assignments in the Foreign Service. He has never been in charge of the Foreign Service personnel in the Far East.

10. SENATOR McCARTHY SAID: . . . Jessup was in charge of the publication of a Communist-front known as the Institute of Pacific Relations. This publication under Jessup spearheaded the Communist Party line and spewed forth the Communist Party line perfumed sewerage . . . This publication was supported by Communist money. Along with the material being furnished you are photostats of checks totaling \$6,000, all signed by the self-proclaimed Communist, Frederick Vanderbilt Field.

THE FACTS: Once again—as it has done following each of Senator McCarthy's ASNE, Chicago, Atlantic City,⁵ and Rochester⁶ speeches—the Department states these facts:

a. Senator McCarthy grossly exaggerated Dr. Jessup's relationship with *Far Eastern Survey*, the publication to which he refers, based on the single fact that, in 1944, Dr. Jessup served on the Research Advisory Committee of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

b. As for Senator McCarthy's charges and implications that the Institute or its publication were bought and paid for by "Communist money," about half of the Institute's budget was met by the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation. Mr. Field's contributions were only a drop in the bucket as compared with the generous donations of large industrial concerns.

Senator McCarthy in previous speeches, had claimed to have "evidence" of contributions from Mr. Field totaling \$6,500 in 2 years. Significantly, however, following the Department's exposure of the fact that one of the photostated checks included in that "evidence" was payable not to the Institute of Pacific Relations but to the American Council on Soviet Relations, a totally unrelated organization, he now reduces his figure to \$6,000.

⁵ See BULLETIN of June 12, 1950, p. 963, 966, 968, for analysis.

⁶ BULLETIN of June 19, 1950, p. 1012.

Where We Stand Today

by Francis H. Russell
*Director, Office of Public Affairs*¹

It is a good thing for us to give some attention every once in a while to that famous bit of advice of Daniel Webster. "When the mariner," he said, "has been tossed for many days in thick weather . . . he naturally avails himself of the first pause in the storm to take his latitude and ascertain how far the elements have driven him from his true course. Let us," said Webster, "imitate this prudence."

The storm Webster was concerned about had been a storm of words. The American people today are entitled to feel that they know what Webster meant. In fact, we may wonder whether Webster could possibly have had any idea of what a storm of words can really be. In a time of the nation's most pressing need for unity, vision, and clear-headedness, the air has been filled instead with patently false accusations, trumped-up suspicion, and artificial schisms. Our energies have been diverted from the dangers that are real to bogies that are fictitious.

But we are beginning to emerge from this emotional and mental orgy. Although this impression that we are on the point of enjoying a pause in the storm may prove wholly illusory, it may be prudent to make believe there is a pause while we try to "take our latitude" in the real world that lies about us.

Let us first remind ourselves that in the important struggles of mankind victory has never come easily and at once. Always along the way there are ebbs and flows. If it were a matter of all victories and no setbacks, we should not have to spend our concern on the issue.

I should like to examine broadly this evening how we stand with respect to the ebb and the flow in the two great tasks that today face the people of the world: the first, of course, being the task of creating a healthy world order with adequate political instrumentalities to make possible world

peace and economic and social progress; and the second, the task of protecting and advancing human freedom.

It is a ticklish business plotting broad trends contemporaneously but that is what anyone must do who wants to "take his latitude" and map his course.

This plotting does not call for a discourse on the successes that we have achieved in our foreign policy during the past half decade: the setting up of international institutions on a democratic pattern, the United Nations with its specialized agencies, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Organization of American States; the program for economic recovery in Europe; the plans for military security of the democracies, and all the rest. They are firmly in the record. So are the obstacles that have been faced: inertia, ancient hatreds, totalitarian measures of aggression. What I would like to do, rather, is to examine two or three of the most crucial world situations and to point to some recent developments that bear on our current reckoning.

The Far East

The major development in the Far East has been, of course, the seizure of China by the Chinese Communists.

There is a tendency sometimes for Americans to ask themselves and those who have been most immediately responsible for our policies in that area, "What went wrong? Who was asleep at the switch? What was it that should have been done that was not done?" China constitutes a large chunk of the world's surface, and the people who inhabit that area are a sizable portion of the world's population. The overrunning of that area by forces allied to the Kremlin is, obviously, an adverse factor of some magnitude in the current issue between totalitarianism and democracy.

It is natural for people who have been largely preoccupied with domestic problems, over which

¹ An address made at Radcliffe College, Boston, Mass., June 19 and released to the press on the same date.

we have a large measure of control and where, if something goes wrong, we can pin the responsibility, to assume the same attitude toward problems abroad. But, obviously, there is a basic difference. Since we believe in the right of each people to work out their own way of life, we realize, when we stop to think of it, that it is not and should not be possible for the people of one country to have the final determination on what shall take place in another country. We may take a friendly interest. We may offer help. We may recognize the importance of what takes place in another country to the cause of world peace and freedom, but, in the final analysis, it is for the people of each country to determine whose help they will accept, what use they will make of it, and what leaders they will follow.

The Chinese people for more than a generation have been in a mood of revolt against the feudal system that had prevailed in their country since the dawn of history. They knew that modern methods of government and modern technology made possible a higher standard of living than they enjoyed. For a decade, they pinned their hopes for the accomplishment of their objective of a better life on the Kuomintang. Gradually, however, the idea became fixed in the minds of the Chinese people that the Kuomintang had come under the domination of a small clique of men who had no interest in the welfare of the Chinese people as a whole and that the Kuomintang was either unable or unwilling to make the necessary changes in Chinese life. With the spread of this conviction, support for the regime disappeared.

Many of the soldiers in the Nationalist Army merely laid down their arms when they came into the presence of the Communist forces, because they felt the Government they were supposed to be fighting for offered no hope for them or their families. The Nationalist Government was driven farther and farther back and, finally, off the mainland of Asia onto Formosa.

U.S. POLICY IN ASIA

There were three things that the United States could do to stem this development. Two of them she did. The first was to provide substantial assistance to the Nationalist Government in the form of military equipment, food and other supplies, and funds. More than half of the total income of the Nationalist Government, during the 4 years following the cessation of the war with Japan, came in the form of assistance from the United States. In all major engagements, the Nationalist Armies had a superiority in equipment over the Communist forces.

The second thing that we could do, and did, was to send a great American of our time, one whose integrity and persuasiveness are unexcelled, George Marshall, in an effort to convince the Kuomintang of the necessity of measures on its

part to reestablish itself with the Chinese people and to offer American economic aid in any such effort. General Marshall failed in this effort. It can be assumed that any other person that could have been sent would have failed too.

The third thing that we could have done, but did not do, was to send American generals, American aviators, American soldiers, to take part in the Chinese civil war. If we had sent forces on a sufficient scale there can be little doubt but that the Communist armies would have been turned back—but with two results:

First, we would, thereby, have committed our limited resources to China, whose productive power and strength from the point of view of international strategy is very small, at the expense of Western Europe which is second only to the United States in its peacetime and wartime potential.

Secondly, and even more important, if we had sent American armed forces to take part against the Chinese Communists, we would have wound up with the resentment of the Chinese people who would have considered that we had crammed down their throats a government in which they had lost all confidence and all respect. More than that, we would have incurred the resentment of other hundreds of millions of people who live on the periphery of China. We would have "won a battle and lost the campaign" in the effort to forge ties of friendship between ourselves and the people of the East. We could not and we cannot afford to make enemies of the entire population of the Far East either in terms of our current objectives or in terms of the long-range relations between the peoples of that area and the West.

The determination of the Chinese people to abandon the Nationalist Government, and the resulting seizure of power by the Communists, is an adverse development which should not and cannot be minimized.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

But I said I was going to talk in terms of recent developments and their significance for the immediate future. The significant change in the situation in the Far East is this:

Up to the present time, we have been attempting to deal with a situation in a country where the Government was losing the support of the people, disastrously and increasingly, day by day. For that reason, the aid which we gave in large amounts was ineffective. There was no government that was representative of the people with whom the United States could work to preserve and extend the freedom of the Chinese people. The creation of such a government was a matter beyond the power of the United States.

Now, however, the situation that we face in the Far East, while still one of great difficulty, is one that has less of the characteristics of a quagmire.

It is sometimes better to take a step or two back and get a firm footing.

In the case of China, the possibilities of action on our part for the immediate future are severely limited, but they are definable. We intend to do everything we can to maintain communication with the Chinese people; to make it plain to them that we are prepared to aid them in their efforts to improve their lot to the extent they make possible by renouncing the foreign domination which sooner or later they will know has been foisted upon them.

By contrast, there are countries like Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, and Japan where democracy is well-established and where we shall do everything that is necessary to prevent their independence and democracy from being successfully attacked.

In between are the countries like Indonesia, Indochina, Burma, and Korea, where independence has only recently been won and where the new Governments and their people are struggling against fearful odds to get democratic institutions started and to improve the desperately low standards of living. They are faced with nearly overpowering problems: illiteracy, wretched health, an utter lack of experience in self-government, frequently not even adequate means of communication between the government and the people. These people are not interested in becoming party to the world's ideological struggle, in being cannon fodder in what they regard as other people's battles. They feel that they have problems enough of their own. They will shy away from any effort to involve them.

If, however, we can convince them that our objectives with respect to them are only to help them accomplish their own objectives of internal development and improvement they will welcome our aid, and, through it, they will be better able to prevent Soviet penetration or domination.

The United States is the best able of all countries in the world to assist these people. Our big job is to convince them that we desire to assist them without requiring them to assume commitments.

We are, therefore, dealing with a manageable situation now in the Far East. We are dealing with a situation where the things that we wish to do can be done and not, as before, with a deteriorating situation that was beyond our power to influence. We are dealing with a situation where there are long-term factors which can work strongly in our favor. There is not only the good will that will accrue to us from our past and present policies, but there is the ancient deep-seated determination of the Chinese people to throw off any outside domination. There is the ability of the American people to cooperate with other peoples who are engaged in improving their standard of life. There is the appeal of human freedom, an appeal which becomes stronger the more it is denied.

In the Far East, then, we are in a situation where one of our valued allies has temporarily gone under. We have witnessed an eastern "Battle of France." But the lines in this struggle for peace and freedom are now drawn on more favorable territory. The struggle in this area for freedom and progress is by no means irretrievably lost.

The European Situation

Let us look at the situation in Europe. The Economic Recovery Program is well under way. Much of the rubble has been cleared away. The factories are in operation. The people are being fed. Two problems remain of serious dimensions.

GERMANY

First is the problem of Germany. Germany is the greatest center of productive power outside the United States. It is a matter of first importance that this power not come into the hands of those who are directing the Soviet conspiracy against the freedom of the world. It is equally important that the German people themselves not be permitted again to become a threat against the world. Both of these ends can be met only by making Germany an integral part of a closely knit pattern of Western Europe.

It has been apparent that the leadership in this effort would have to come from the French. For a few years following the war, the French gave no indication that they had the will or the capacity to undertake this leadership. Their morale had been shattered by the experience of the war. The British, concerned with their own special economic problems and wanting to maintain their position as the center of the British Commonwealth of nations, were unwilling to merge their political and economic sovereignty in such a pattern of Western Europe. Now, however, with the proposals recently made by Mr. Schuman for a French-German coal and steel pool, in which other European countries would be invited to join, the action that can and must be taken to solve the problem of Germany and of Western Europe has become much clearer. This reemergence of French statesmanship is one of the most encouraging signs of the postwar period. The "flow" here is setting in.

PROBLEM OF SECURITY

The second problem of Europe is security against the possibility of aggression by the Soviet Union. This security has been profoundly and favorably affected by the developments that have recently taken place in weapons of war. The countries that want peace and security today are more fortunate than those that wanted them when Hitler was on the march. The rise of Hitler coin-

cided with a period of superiority of weapons of aggression over weapons of defense. The armored division and the bombing plane were mightier than the means of defense against them. The only effective defense then was to construct a more powerful offense.

Today, there are indications that the pendulum is swinging back, that the balance will be in favor not of countries who are threatening to engulf other peoples but in favor of those who wish to defend themselves, their peace, and their liberties against aggression. This development is unfavorable from the point of view of the Soviet Union, which has made abundantly clear its purpose of extending as far and as rapidly as possible the number of countries satellite to it. The jet fighter plane, the guided missile, the improved bazooka, and radar are all weapons of defense, not weapons of aggression. They are, therefore, weapons that strengthen the hands of the people of the world who covet no additional territories, no domination over other peoples. They strengthen the non-Communist world which wishes only for the right of each people to work out its own way of life in its own way. The "flow" here in the direction of peace is strong.

BATTLE OF IDEOLOGIES

The third problem today relates to the struggle for the minds of men. It has fallen to our lot to be living at the point in world history when two great concepts of human existence are pitted in what may be the conflict from which one or the other will emerge and prevail for as long into the future as we can see.

One concept is, of course, the belief that the life, the interests, the integrity, the growth, the happiness of the individual human being is the ultimate value and that human institutions exist to promote that value. This belief is the concept of life that emerges from the great religions of the world. It has been developed by the political philosophers of the Western world. It has produced among other ways of life our American democracy. The preamble to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts puts it like this:

The end of government is to furnish all of the individuals who compose it with the power of enjoying the blessings of life.

The other philosophy, that also has roots going far back into history, is premised upon the concept of the state, the corporate entity, as the ultimate value. Human beings exist only as expendable items, as cogs, of no value in themselves other than as they contribute to this artificial entity. This philosophy asserts that all human thought, all human activity must be dominated by the state and devoted to the ends of the state. This concept, the intellectual product of Hegel, Fichte, Feuerbach, and Kant, produced as one of its offshoots nazism; as another, Soviet communism.

The results of its application are found in the present-day police state, slave labor, the drive for world domination, the effort to create artificial economic chaos and want, the efforts to render international institutions ineffective, in the drive to intensify international insecurity and tension, and in the all-out assault upon human freedom.

The Soviet leaders have several kinds of head-start in the race for the minds of the people of the world. They have been carrying on an energetic propaganda campaign for several score of years. Their philosophies are rigid and uniform so that they lend themselves to packaged thinking and packaged explanation. It is easier to tear down and to destroy than it is to build. It is easier to create doubt and suspicion than it is to create confidence. It is easier to set forth a rigid monolithic theory than something whose virtues flow from diversification and flexibility.

But here, too, there has been a "flow." There has been growing discrimination by the great majority of people in appraising various proposals for an easy out from their problems. There has also been a growing awareness of the spurious nature of many proposals to which the attractive word "peace" has been affixed.

For example, the Communists have recently been active in Europe in obtaining signatures to what they call "an appeal." This appeal reads as follows:

We demand the absolute banning of the atom weapon, arm of terror and mass extermination of populations.

We demand the establishment of strict international control to insure the implementation of this banning measure.

We consider that any government which would be first to use the atom weapon against any country whatsoever would be committing a crime against humanity and should be dealt with as a war criminal.

We call on all men of good will throughout the world to sign this appeal.

The Communists are now making plans to circulate this appeal in this country in a campaign beginning in the next 2 or 3 weeks and extending through next October.

What is the background of this "appeal?"

True Nature of the Soviet "Appeal"

The United Nations has been tackling the problem of how to achieve security against the destructiveness of the atom bomb for the past 4 years. All of the member nations outside of the Soviet Union with its satellites are agreed on the essentials for effective control. The basic factors of the situation have led to these essentials with the inevitability of the multiplication table. Because the stuff that is used for atomic power to run factories can in a matter of hours be put into a piece of machinery that converts it into an atom bomb, it is necessary to have some international agency, in which all nations will have confidence, in control of atomic materials from the time the minerals are first extracted from the earth until the last

ounce of energy has been expended. Mere promises will not suffice. We have found that Soviet promises are often broken. We must assume that they would be broken in the future. Production and control by an international agency is the only guaranty of security. All the members of the United Nations except the Soviet Union and its satellites have indicated their willingness to take this course.

Why has the Soviet Union refused? Because the operations of an international agency would, to some degree, breach the Iron Curtain that the Soviet Union has erected around the area of the earth that it controls. Faced as it was by the necessity of a choice between cooperating in a program of security against the atom bomb and maintaining the Iron Curtain, the Soviet Union chose the latter. To put a better front on this position, however, it has come up with some alternatives—alternatives which place a premium upon bad faith and evasion. The Soviet Union proposals are: First, that all countries agree not to make any atomic bombs and, second, that all countries agree not to be first to use the atom bomb.

The first of these proposals means that countries with democratic institutions whose budgets and policies are necessarily matters of public knowledge would be at the mercy of countries which operate behind an iron curtain and whose every activity is a state secret.

The second agreement would mean that during the period when the Soviet Union was supreme in mass armies, which it refuses to reduce, and comparatively weak in its development of atomic weapons, it would be asking the rest of the world to discard atomic weapons and leave itself at the mercy of the Soviet armies. The "appeal" which the Communists are circulating is an appeal to provide these strategic advantages for the Soviet Union.

It is necessary in the present world for people to read the fine print in resolutions that are presented to them; even more, to read between the lines of the fine print.

In spite of propaganda barrages, however, democracy and freedom still remain for the great majority of the people of the world the most attractive way of life. This fact is shown by the votes in the United Nations. It is shown by the vast dissatisfactions among many of the people living in police states behind the Iron Curtain.

Moreover, believers in democracy are once again becoming articulate. We are beginning to reexamine and define the things by which we live. There has been an encouraging increase in articles and books on the philosophical foundations of democracy. We are once again taking on the job of becoming political philosophers and are meeting the adversary in that field.

These, I believe, are some of the developments in the world's situation during the last few weeks and months that future historians may point to as milestones at the midpoint of the twentieth cen-

tury having significant bearing on the effort to build a world marked by confidence and cooperative effort.

They are not guaranties of success. No generation can pass on to its successors the boon for human freedom fully forged and forever guaranteed. The most each age can do is to bequeath to the next a living freedom, to be extended, strengthened, and, if necessary, defended. The most that any generation can ask is to have a freedom to defend.

There are, as we have seen, those who get greater zest out of throwing stones at those who are in the front line than in joining in the effort. But that has always been.

I said when I began that there were two issues in the world. One was creating the structure of peace and the other protecting our freedoms. In fact, however, they are one and the same. The struggle for freedom today is the struggle for peace. Those who menace our peace would destroy our freedom. It is because freedom is being challenged all over the world that we have become universally preoccupied with the defense of peace. It is because freedom is won or lost in so many different ways and in such varying degrees that these efforts reach into every kind of activity and every area of life, compelling us to work on a universal front.

Present U.S. Strategy

It is for this reason that the broad strategy which we must follow is the strategy of doing what has to be done. It used to be a tenet of nineteenth century international political philosophy that the people of the United States should concern themselves only with the things that they are able effectively to control. That was true in the nineteenth century world. It is not true in the world of today. The people of Arizona, cannot make their will absolutely effective in Massachusetts, but they have a right, indeed a duty, to take a position on matters in Massachusetts that affect the national interest. Similarly, the world today is one, and we cannot make it otherwise.

The history of the last 3 years in Greece is a case in point. There were those who said that we should not give assistance to the Greek Government in its effort to preserve the freedom of that country from outside aggressions, because we were not in a position to exercise absolute authority in that sector of the world, because we could not guarantee the outcome. However, because the Greeks were threatened with engulfment, and because the free world could not afford to see one country after another succumb, we provided help, and, today, Greece and Turkey, and the Near East to which they are the pathway, are still free. A world order is emerging in which the test of what each country is called upon to do is not its own ability to control the

outcome, but rather what is needed as a part of the whole.

This new world order will not, we may be sure, be patterned exactly on anything that has gone before. Like all living, strong political organizations, it must be fashioned according to the particular facts and needs with which it must deal. It will be a complex of United Nations organs and agencies, coal and steel and atomic energy authorities, North Atlantic and inter-American, and other regional organizations, all designed for the job at hand.

Here again, it seems clear, events are in our direction. These organizations are democratic in their structure and operation. They are based upon the principles of free discussion, free voting by the members, the prevailing of the will of the majority with safeguards of the rights of the minority. These are our kind of outfit. Collectively, they can carry us far down the road to a healthy world.

We cannot afford to be either optimists or pessimists in this great struggle of our time. The outcome is not predetermined. It is largely in our hands, because the leadership of the free world has fallen to us. What we say, what we do, what we tear down, what we support, all bear on the extent of each ebb and the strength of each flow and will determine the final direction of the tide.

U.S. Replies to Rumanian Protest Against Restrictive Travel Order

[Released to the press July 6]

The United States Government has replied to the Rumanian Government's protest of June 19, 1950, regarding the institution of restrictions on travel by personnel of the Rumanian Legation at Washington.¹ The text of the United States note, delivered to the Rumanian Legation on July 3, 1950, follows.

The Secretary of State presents his compliments to the Honorable the Minister of Rumania and, with reference to his note No. 2421 of June 19, 1950, has the honor to respond to the Rumanian Government's protest against regulations which the United States Government has instituted in respect of travel by personnel of the Rumanian Legation at Washington.

It is of interest to note the Rumanian Government's explicit acknowledgment that the imposition of travel restrictions by a receiving government upon the official personnel of a sending government constitutes a limitation of the normal activity of a diplomatic Mission. With this view, the United States Government readily agrees.

Restrictions of movement, like restrictions upon the free flow of information and cultural exchange as imposed by the Rumanian Govern-

ment, are basically distasteful to the American people and its Government. Travel regulations applicable to personnel of the Rumanian Legation at Washington have been instituted merely as a reciprocal limitation of diplomatic privilege in view of the nature and effect of travel restrictions as applied by Rumanian authorities to members of the American Legation at Bucharest.

On the one hand, the Rumanian Government complains that restrictions on the travel of its Legation personnel tend to prevent its diplomatic Mission from carrying on its normal activity. On the other hand, the Government of Rumania alleges that its own travel restrictions are applied without discrimination to all diplomatic Missions in Rumania. The inescapable deduction from this argument, if taken at face value, would be that the Rumanian Government is applying measures which tend to prevent the performance of normal activities by all diplomatic Missions in Rumania.

Without debating the artificial contention of the Rumanian Government that its travel restrictions are nondiscriminatory, it may be said that the United States Government rejects the thesis that, no matter how obstructive and abnormal the behavior of a particular state toward American interests and official American representatives, the conduct of United States relations with that state must correspond uniformly with the conduct of United States relations with other states.

At such time as the Rumanian Government may be disposed to remove the restrictions which it has placed upon the travel within Rumania of American Legation personnel, especially in performance of the normal functions of a diplomatic Mission, the United States Government will be prepared to alter accordingly the restrictions which presently apply to travel by personnel of the Rumanian Legation within the United States. Meanwhile, as the Rumanian Government has been informed, the travel procedure will be administered with a view to the current treatment in this regard by Rumanian authorities of the United States representatives in Rumania.

U.S. Survey Mission To Study Philippine Economic Situation

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

[Released to the press by the White House June 29]

The United States Government, at the request of President Elpidio Quirino, is sending an American Economic Survey Mission to Manila to study and report on the present pressing economic problems of the Philippines. When President Quirino was in Washington last February he discussed

¹ BULLETIN of June 5, 1950, p. 921; July 3, 1950, p. 30.

with me some of the difficulties which face his country. The idea of this mission has developed out of these discussions and subsequent ones in Manila between President Quirino and Ambassador Cowen.

The purpose of this mission will be to survey the entire Philippine economic situation, to make recommendations on measures of self-help which might be undertaken by the Philippine Government itself, and to make recommendations on ways in which the United States might be helpful. President Quirino has assured me that this mission will receive the fullest cooperation of the Philippine Government.

The Honorable Daniel W. Bell, President of the American Security and Trust Company of Washington, and formerly Under Secretary of the Treasury, has accepted the important position of chief of the mission. He will be my personal representative, with the personal rank of Ambassador, and will report directly to me. The deputy chief of the mission will be Maj. Gen. Richard J. Marshall, President of the Virginia Military Institute, who has had many years' experience in the Philippines. He will have the personal rank of Minister. Work is now proceeding actively on the selection of the other members of the mission, and I hope it will be prepared to start its work early in July.

I consider this mission to be of the highest importance, not only because of the results which I expect it to produce but also because it is a symbol of the half-century of intimate relationship between the Philippine and American peoples. It is my hope that the mission will further solidify this historic association.

SURVEY MISSION MEMBERSHIP

The Department of State announced on July 7 that the Economic Survey Mission to the Philippines will arrive at Manila on July 10.

Members and advisers of the Mission follow:

Members

- Daniel W. Bell (Chief of Mission), President, American Security and Trust Company, Washington, D.C.
- Richard J. Marshall (Deputy Chief of Mission), Major General, U.S.A., Ret., Superintendent, Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va.
- Edward M. Bernstein (Chief Economist) (On leave of absence from the International Monetary Fund), Washington, D.C.
- August L. Strand (Agricultural Survey), President, Oregon State College, Corvallis, Ore.
- Francis McQuillin (Industry and Power), Assistant to the President, West Penn Power Company, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Advisers

- Alvin H. Cross (Fiscal Management), Deputy Commissioner, Accounts and Collection Unit, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury

- Michael J. Deutch (Industrial Engineering), 1737 H Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
- David I. Ferber (Political Adviser), Foreign Service Officer, Department of State
- Lawrence Fleishman (Fiscal Management), Supervising Customs Agent, Department of the Treasury, Seattle, Wash.
- Joseph B. Friedman (Legal Affairs), 1026 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
- Wilbur A. Gallahan (Fiscal Management), Tax Adviser to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury
- William T. Heffelfinger (Fiscal Management), Assistant to the Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Department of the Treasury
- Richard A. Miller (Distribution and Trade), 420 East 23d Street, New York
- Austin Nisonger (Fiscal Management), Deputy Chief, Accounting Division, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce
- Jameson Parker (Public Relations), 2116 Bancroft Place, NW., Washington, D.C.
- Clarence M. Purves (Agriculture), Assistant Chief, Regional Investigations Branch, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, Department of Agriculture
- Louis Shere (Taxation), Professor of Economics and Director of Tax Research, University of Indiana, Bloomington, Ind.
- William W. Tamplin (Mining), Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior
- Donald Thompson (Banking), Vice President, Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio
- Carlton L. Wood (Distribution and Trade), Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce

German Export-Import Figures for 1947-48 Released

The Department of State on June 22 released the report of an international firm of auditors on the audit of the Joint Export-Import Agency accounts for the years 1947-48. JEIA was the official military government agency which, during the period covered by these accounts, was responsible for the trade and commerce of the United States-United Kingdom bizonal area of Germany. The agency's responsibility was, subsequently, extended to the French zone as well.

With the formation of the German Government late in 1949, JEIA's responsibilities were gradually assigned to German agencies, and the organization was terminated on December 19, 1949. The organization is now in liquidation, and an audit for the period from January to September 30, 1949, is now under way, with final audit at date of complete liquidation.

Assets on December 31, 1948, consisted of balances in foreign banks of \$296,328,274 and accounts receivable at \$182,312,474, for a total of \$478,640,748. The principal liabilities were accounts payable at \$82,174,711, and the capital of the agency was \$125,355,504, consisting of equal United States-United Kingdom contributions in the manner specified in the bizonal fusion agreement of December 2, 1946.

The United States in the United Nations

[July 8-14]

Secretary-General's Communiqué on Korea

All United Nations members, with the exceptions of Yugoslavia and Egypt, had, by July 13, replied to the circular telegram sent out by Secretary-General Lie inquiring about the type of assistance members might be prepared to offer in implementation of the Security Council resolution of June 27.¹ Fifty-two replies from members, as well as two from nonmembers—Italy and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, acknowledge the communication and indicate moral support and, in some cases, offer direct military assistance or other material aid. Byelorussia, the U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the Ukraine rejected the Security Council action as "illegal, as did the Chinese Communist regime and North Korea.

Economic and Social Council

During the second week of its eleventh session, now in progress at Geneva, the Economic and Social Council concluded general debate on methods for financing economic development of underdeveloped countries, approved the report of the Statistical Commission, including the resolutions contained therein, and almost completed consideration of the report of the Transport and Communications Commission.

The question of methods for financing economic development of underdeveloped countries was referred to the Council's Economic Committee for more detailed study. In the course of the general debate, Isidor Lubin of the United States commented on the progress that had been made in reaching a common understanding of the basic elements of the problem of economic development. Not only was there a full realization that internal effort and organization on the part of the countries themselves is required, he said, but also that capital from foreign sources, both private and public, can play a vital part in the process. One of the major tasks before the Council, Mr. Lubin continued, "is to try to analyze the conditions and factors which may affect the pace and scope of economic development in the near future."

The Council approved a number of proposals of the Transport and Communications Commission

in connection with consideration of its report. One of the approved resolutions recommends ratification of the convention establishing the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, and, in this connection, Mr. Lubin announced that the United States Senate had ratified this convention. Other resolutions involved proposals to remove barriers to international transport of goods, coordination of inland transport, maritime shipping affecting Latin America, international road transport, the problem of pollution of sea water, and implementation of the decisions of the Atlantic City telecommunications conference in 1947.

A resolution authorizing the Secretary-General, on the advice of the Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements, to convene a conference to consider international commodity problems was referred, after India's opposition, to the Council's Economic Committee for further study.

Interim Committee

On July 13, the Interim Committee opened discussion on disposition of the former Italian colony of Eritrea, with presentation of the report of the United Nations Commission for Eritrea by Rapporteur Ziaud Din of Pakistan. The report puts forth three different proposals for the disposition of Eritrea. The first, favored by the delegations of Burma and the Union of South Africa, calls for a federation of Eritrea, as a self-governing unit, with Ethiopia, under the sovereignty of the Ethiopian Crown. The second proposal, submitted by the Norwegian delegation, suggested re-union of Eritrea with Ethiopia, with provision that the western province could provisionally and for a limited period of time be left under the present British administration. The third proposal, submitted by Guatemala and Pakistan, would place Eritrea under direct United Nations trusteeship for a maximum period of 10 years, at the end of which it would become independent.

In the ensuing debate the Norwegian and South African delegates supported, in general, the proposals of their Commission representatives, while the United Kingdom delegate spoke in favor of a partition plan. The Burmese and Pakistani representatives, lacking instructions, reserved their right to speak when the debate resumes on July 14.

¹ BULLETIN of July 3, 1950, p. 7.

Contents

General Policy

U.N. Places Unified Command of Military Forces in Korea Under United States:	
Text of Security Council Resolution . . .	83
General MacArthur Designated as Commanding General. Statement by the President	83
The United Nations and Korea. By Philip C. Jessup	84
Charging South Korea as Aggressor Reminiscent of Nazi Tactics. Statement by Secretary Acheson	87
U.S. Military Actions in Korea. Addresses by John Foster Dulles:	
New Phase of American Foreign Policy . .	88
The Interdependence of Independence . .	91
New Challenges to American Diplomacy. By George C. McGhee	96
Where We Stand Today. By Francis H. Russell	112
U.S. Replies to Rumanian Protest Against Restrictive Travel Order	117

The United Nations and Specialized Agencies

U.N. Places Unified Command of Military Forces in Korea Under United States:	
Text of Security Council Resolution . . .	83
General MacArthur Designated as Commanding General. Statement by the President	83
The United Nations and Korea. By Philip C. Jessup	84

The United Nations and

Specialized Agencies—Continued

U.N. Commission Reestablishes Headquarters in Korea	92
The United States in the United Nations . .	119

Economic Affairs

U.S. Survey Mission To Study Philippine Economic Situation:	
Statement by the President	117
Survey Mission Membership	118

International Information and Cultural Affairs

Support for an Expanded Information and Education Program. Statement by Secretary Acheson	100
Forging a Free World With a Truth Campaign. By Edward W. Barrett	103

Technical Assistance

Point Four: An Investment in Peace. Address by the President	93
--	----

The Department

Analysis of Senator McCarthy's Public Statements	106
--	-----

Publications

Foreign Relations Volumes, 1933, Released .	95
German Export-Import Figures for 1947-48 Released	118